

JPRS-TAC-88-021
13 JUNE 1988



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-88-021

CONTENTS

13 JUNE 1988

CHINA

LIAOWANG Talks With UN Official on Disarmament [Qian Wenrong; Beijing LIAOWANG, 23 May 88]	1
Soviet, U.S. Positions on Conventional Forces [Beijing XINHUA, 30 May 88]	2
Reagan, Gorbachev Optimistic on START Treaty [Beijing XINHUA, 31 May 88]	3
RENMIN RIBAO On Disarmament, World Peace [Liu Kaichen; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 31 May 88]	4
Disarmament Document Outlines Concrete Proposals [Qian Wenrong; Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 1 Jun 88]	5
Qian Qichen Speaks at UN Disarmament Session [Beijing XINHUA, 2 Jun 88]	5
Outlines Disarmament Goals [Beijing XINHUA, 2 Jun 88]	6
Text of Speech [Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 2 Jun 88]	7
Lack of Progress at Moscow Summit Noted [Beijing in Russian to the USSR, 1 Jun 88]	8
RENMIN RIBAO on Strategic Arms Talks [Zhang Qixin; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO Overseas Edition, 1 Jun 88]	9
START Accord Unlikely During Reagan Term [Shen Yiming; Beijing XINHUA, 2 Jun 88]	10
XINHUA Analyzes U.S.-Soviet Summit [Yuan Rongsheng; Beijing XINHUA, 2 Jun 88]	11
XINHUA 'Commentary' Views U.S.-Soviet Summit [Shen Yiming; Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 2 Jun 88]	12
XINHUA 'News Analysis' on Summit [Shen Yiming; Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 3 Jun 88]	13
Russian-Language Radio Beam's View [Hung Bo; Beijing in Russian to the USSR, 3 Jun 88]	14
RENMIN RIBAO Overseas 'Commentary' [Zhang Qixin and Zhou Xiangguang; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO Overseas Edition, 4 Jun 88]	15
CHINA DAILY Comments [Beijing CHINA DAILY, 4 Jun 88]	16
RENMIN RIBAO Commentators Article [Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 5 Jun 88]	16

EAST EUROPE

INTRABLOC

International Parliamentary Meeting Held in Sofia	18
USSR Delegation Arrives [Sofia Domestic Service, 29 May 88]	18
Todorov Receives Group [Sofia Domestic Service, 30 May 88]	18
Vutov Opens Meeting [Sofia BTA, 31 May 88]	18
Participants Discuss Issues [Sofia BTA, 31 May 88]	19
Voss on Soviet Support for Peace [August Voss Interview; Sofia RABO RABOTNICHESKO DELO, 1 Jun 88]	19
Weapons Issues Discussed [Sofia BTA, 1 Jun 88]	20
Romania's Ivascu Speaks [Bucharest AGERPRES, 2 Jun 88]	20
Pact Leaders at Third UN Disarmament Session	21
Fischer Opens Meeting [East Berlin ADN International Service, 31 May 88]	21
Bulgarian Interviewed [Lyuben Gotsev Interview; Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO, 30 May 88]	21

BULGARIA

Foreign Affairs Official Interviewed on Session [Lyuben Gotsev; Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO, 30 May 88]	23
Moscow Summit Positively Assessed [Sofia BTA, 1 Jun 88]	25
Mladenov Meets Balkan, Turkish Officials [Sofia BTA, 5 Jun 88]	26

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

UN Disarmament Session Delegation Appointed [Prague RUDE PRAVO, 27 May 88]	26
Chnoupek Leaves for Session [Prague CTK, 29 May 88]	27
CTK Reports Moscow Summit Opening [Karen Filek; Prague CTK, 29 May 88]	27
U.S. Human Rights Discussion Criticized [Prague CTK, 31 May 88]	27
RUDE PRAVO on U.S. 'Intransigence at Summit' [Milan Jelinek; RUDE PRAVO, 1 Jun 88]	28
CSSR Foreign Minister Speaks at UN Session [Prague CTK, 7 Jun 88]	29
Talks With FRG's Genscher [Bratislava Domestic Service, 7 Jun 88]	30
Meets Greek, French Counterparts [Prague CTK, 3 Jun 88]	30

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Methodists Advocate Nuclear-Free World [East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 28-29 May]	30
Delegation Activities at UN Special Session	30
Fischer, Florin Speak [East Berlin ADN International Service, 31 May 88]	30
Fischer Talks With UN Leader [East Berlin ADN International Service, 1 Jun 88]	31
Fischer Addresses Assembly [East Berlin ADN International Service, 2 Jun 88]	32
Fischer Meets CSSR Official [East Berlin ADN International Service, 2 Jun 88]	32
Fischer Meets PRC, Iranian Counterparts [East Berlin ADN International Service, 1 Jun 88]	32
Moscow Summit, INF Treaty Evaluated	33
Honecker Statement [East Berlin ADN International Service, 1 Jun 88]	33
Spokesman Remarks [East Berlin ADN International Service, 28 May 88]	33
Fischer Addresses UN General Assembly [East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 3 Jun 88]	34

HUNGARY

NEPSZABADSAG on Soviet-U.S. Summit [Budapest MTI, 28 May 88]	37
--	----

ROMANIA

'Military Balance' Through Disarmament Supported	38
Opening of UN Disarmament Session Marked	38
Gorbachev-Reagan Summit in Moscow Reported [Vasile Crisu; Bucharest LUMEA, 2 Jun 88]	39

SOVIET UNION

Civilian Economic Gain From TEL Dismantlement [Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 22 1988]	41
Review of Western Hydroacoustic Mine Hunting Systems [Capt A. Kolpakov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 4 Feb 88]	41
Examination of U.S. Binary Weapons, Delivery Vehicles [M. Platonov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 12 Feb 88]	42
PRAVDA Report From Missile Destruction Site [G. Dildyayev; Moscow PRAVDA, 2 Jun 88]	43
Sarny Missile Base Open for Foreign Journalists [Gennadiy Talalayev; Moscow TASS, 3 Jun 88]	44
SS-20 Dismantling Shown [Moscow Television Service, 4 Jun 88]	44
Report on INF Missile Destruction Sites [Colonels A. Belousov and V. Polezhayev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 4 Jun 88]	45

LIAOWANG Talks With UN Official on Disarmament

HK0406091188 Beijing LIAOWANG in Chinese No 21, 23 May 88 pp 38, 39, 40

["Special dispatch" from the United Nations by LIAOWANG contributing correspondent Qian Wenrong (6929 2429 2837): "The Tasks and Prospects of the Third UN Special Meeting on Disarmament"]

[Text] According to a resolution last year of the 42d UN General Assembly, the third UN special meeting on disarmament will be held at UN headquarters in New York from 31 May to 25 June this year. In an interview with our reporters prior to the meeting, Ming Shikang, UN under secretary general in charge of disarmament affairs, talked about the purpose, significance, tasks, and prospects of this meeting.

The following are the questions and answers of the interview:

Question: Would you please say something about the purpose and significance of the third UN special meeting on disarmament, which will be held very soon after the signing of the INF treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union and before the Moscow summit?

Answer: The first UN special meeting on disarmament was held in 1978, and the second was held in 1982. Six years have passed since then. The importance of disarmament to the entire international community is clear to everyone. The first meeting adopted an important comprehensive strategy on disarmament. The second meeting adopted a resolution on worldwide disarmament and decided to strengthen the plans for disarmament organizations, but this has not been carried out successfully. I think all the UN members have already realized that owing to the turn for the better in the political climate resulting from the general trend of improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations, the time has come for the United Nations to consider what roles the United Nations and other member states (referring to all the members other than the United States and the Soviet Union) should play in the realm of disarmament. The INF treaty is very important. We appreciate it. If it can bring about a 50-percent reduction in the number of strategic nuclear weapons, we will also be pleased. But it is just a bilateral disarmament plan. We hope that it will help promote multilateral disarmament. In the realm of multilateral disarmament, we have many important tasks, including the conclusion of a treaty on chemical weapons and many other problems concerning the prevention of nuclear proliferation, as well as other matters of interest to the member states. In this sense, I think that at the forthcoming special meeting on disarmament, all UN member states will be able to study the current situation together and decide jointly the worldwide disarmament policy for the future. It is wise to do so.

Question: What are the main questions to discuss at the third UN special meeting?

Answer: Many member states are particularly interested in item No 12 for discussion: What will be the influence of modern science and technology on the arms race? People now are apprehensive that although some important measures have been taken by Europe for nuclear disarmament, there can still be certain new arms races in the field of conventional weapons. If conventional weapons are modernized by means of new military technologies, the range of the new arms race may become unrestrained. For this reason, people have become interested in discussing the disarmament question from the angle of scientific and technological development. It is estimated that about a quarter of all the scientists and engineers in the world are engaged in military research. This could possibly become the root cause of instability in the world situation. Therefore, item No 12 will involve both the quantity and quality of the arms race.

Moreover, the meeting will make an overall appraisal of the world situation since 1982. It will also discuss the relationship between disarmament and development. The arms race will not only affect the economies of the developing countries but will also bring about disastrous effects for the two superpowers, which are spending too much money on military expenses. Although there are different opinions among various member states on the relationship between disarmament and development, I believe that no one would doubt that there are certain connections between the two. Perhaps the money saved from disarmament would not be totally used in development. Some of the money would have to be spent for carrying out the necessary inspection measures according to the disarmament agreement. The meeting will also discuss and examine matters concerning the disarmament organs of the United Nations.

At the meeting, there will also be a substantial discussion on nuclear disarmament, including an overall prohibition on nuclear testing, and the question of conventional weapons, especially powerful antipersonnel weapons such as chemical weapons. I hope this meeting will bring about the early conclusion of a treaty on chemical weapons.

In addition, the meeting will discuss measures for inspection and confidence building as well as the question of regional disarmament. This is because an agreement has already been reached between the East and West, between the members of the Warsaw Pact and the NATO countries, with regard to the Stockholm document. According to this agreement, both the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries can send observers to watch the military exercises of the other side. People now are interested in and are entertaining hopes on the matter of extending the confidence building measures to Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The meeting will discuss many questions concerning regional disarmament, including the establishment of nuclear-free zones.

Question: What roles do you think the superpowers will play at the third UN special meeting?

Answer: The roles of the superpowers are very important. A reason that the second UN special meeting on disarmament was not very successful was because the relationship between the two superpowers was very bad at that time. Fortunately, it has now improved, though still not satisfactorily. I believe that the progress Washington and Moscow have made on the question of bilateral disarmament will also be reflected by the progress in multilateral and global disarmament. However, the achievements of bilateral disarmament will not necessarily bring about success in multilateral disarmament. Therefore, we must watch it carefully. At the same time, we must never allow the two superpowers to obstruct the United Nations from making headway in disarmament after they have reached agreement in this respect. In my opinion, if the United Nations and the Geneva Disarmament Conference can achieve successes in certain fields, such as prohibiting chemical weapons and strengthening the nuclear nonproliferation organizations, it will be good for all countries, including the superpowers.

Question: The nonaligned countries will meet in Havana to a special ministerial-level conference on disarmament on the eve of the third UN special meeting. Would you please say something about the role the Nonaligned Movement will possibly play on the UN special meeting?

Answer: I think the role of the Nonaligned Movement is very important. It can be said that the Nonaligned Movement is of key importance to ensuring the positive achievements of the third UN special meeting. All three UN special meetings on disarmament have been sponsored by the nonaligned countries. I hope they will adopt a responsible and realistic stand and will look ahead. I think it is important for all of us not to place excessively high hopes on it and not to try to solve every problem at the meeting. Instead, we must strive to solve certain concrete problems and determine the main targets for the next decade in the sphere of disarmament. These targets cannot be separated from the leading role of the nonaligned countries.

Question: Would you please say something about the prospects of the third UN special meeting and the possible concrete achievements it may attain?

Answer: There are three things to consider. First, I am pleased to see that the leaders of many countries will attend the meeting. At present, the heads of state and government of 22 countries have said they will attend the meeting. In addition, there will also be many foreign ministers, including the Chinese foreign minister. This shows that the governments of various countries have attached great importance to the question of disarmament and this UN special meeting.

Second, some nongovernmental organizations will also send representatives to the meeting. I am very pleased that more than 200 nongovernmental organizations intend to attend. The committee of nongovernmental organizations indicated that we should have at least more than 90 representatives from nongovernmental organizations to speak at the meeting. China's nongovernmental organizations will also send representatives to the meeting. This shows that the public also attaches great importance to this UN special meeting.

Third, it is hoped that a substantial agreement can be reached on the disarmament program. The preparatory committee held a meeting to discuss the matter in January and February this year, but could not adopt any draft programs. All member states will be able to discuss the details of the disarmament program during the meeting. I hope it will be adopted unanimously. However, we will still have to see whether agreements can be reached on all the complicated problems of disarmament.

Question: How do you appraise the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. Moscow summit? Can the two superpowers reach an agreement on the question of reducing by 50 percent their strategic nuclear weapons? If not, what will be the possible outcome?

Answer: I hope the U.S. and Soviet leaders will be able to reach an important and positive agreement on disarmament. They have all said that they will make efforts to reduce by 50 percent their strategic nuclear weapons. However, government officials of both countries have told me that there are little differences between the two sides on some major issues, such as on the question of the sea-launched cruise missiles. Moreover, the question of inspection is also a very, very complicated issue. Therefore, the two leaders may, at most, reach a programmatic agreement on reducing 50 percent of their strategic weapons without reaching any concrete agreements. Nevertheless, owing to the signing of the INF treaty and the agreement on the Afghan issue, the current atmosphere between the two superpowers is helpful to reaching other agreements. Whatever agreements they may reach on the question of disarmament should be praised by the international community. After all, they have more weapons than any other countries in the world.

Soviet, U.S. Positions on Conventional Forces
OW3005131588 Beijing XINHUA in English
0101 GMT 30 May 88

["Backgrounder: Soviet, U.S. Positions on Conventional Forces Reduction"—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Beijing, May 30 (XINHUA)—Cuts in the conventional forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO will be one of the disarmament questions to be discussed by Soviet and U.S. leaders at their current Moscow summit.

So far, the only negotiation on the question has been the talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe, which began in Vienna in 1973 with the participation of 19 member nations of the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

The negotiation has been in a deadlock almost since it started, with no progress made in the past 15 years.

The West has insisted that Warsaw Pact countries should make bigger reductions in their conventional forces as they have an obvious edge over NATO in military strength in Central Europe. However, the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies refuse to recognize this. Hence, the issue constitutes the focus of the difference between the two sides. The West estimates NATO's overall military presence in Central Europe at 730,000 troops and the Warsaw Pact's at 935,000, with a gap of about 200,000 between the two.

The Soviet Union, however, has long claimed that the two sides' military forces in Central Europe are almost of the same size.

Therefore, NATO has insisted on the principle of "balanced" reduction in Central Europe, while the Warsaw Pact calls for "reciprocal" cuts.

On verification, NATO has pressed for on the spot verification, which the Warsaw Pact has turned down in favor of only exchanging information on troops that will be reduced and the time the whole reduction process takes and establishing three to four observatory stations for verification.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States have softened their positions on disarmament negotiations in recent years, especially after the two superpowers signed the intermediate-range nuclear forces treaty last December, which is believed to have given an incentive to the talks on conventional forces reduction. Now the Soviet Union admits an imbalance in the conventional forces of the two sides in Central Europe and has expressed its willingness to make efforts for overcoming the imbalance. However, judging from the present situation, neither country is giving priority to this question and it is unlikely that any concrete agreement would come out of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit.

In view of the impasse in the negotiations on the reduction of conventional forces in Central Europe and the positive changes in East-West relations, the Warsaw Pact and NATO have since February last year been engaged in preparatory talks in Vienna on arms reduction in the whole Europe as a substitute for the talks on reduction in Central Europe.

Following is a comparison between the conventional forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO in Europe (source: the Swedish Defense Research Bureau, 1985):

	NATO	Warsaw Pact
Troops	1,047,000	1,250,000
Tanks	9,770	28,500
Fighters	2,368	3,345

Reagan, Gorbachev Optimistic on START Treaty
OW3105144388 Beijing XINHUA in English
1350 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 31 (XINHUA)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan today expressed the hope to conclude the strategic arms treaty before next January, while major obstacles to the accord remain in the way. Speaking to reporters at the start of their third round of summit talks here this morning, Gorbachev said "I am sure that if the President makes good use of the time remaining to him, I am sure we will be able to prepare the treaty" to slash by half the superpowers' strategic arms.

Since both sides have maintained that it is impossible to sign such an accord in the short period of the Moscow summit, Gorbachev presumably meant to obtain the pact in the remaining months of Reagan's term, which expires next January.

Reagan agreed when asked whether he also thought such a treaty could be concluded, saying, "Yes, I am very pleased to hear what they (his Soviet hosts) are saying."

"Maybe now it is again time to bang our fists on the table once again," Gorbachev said, recalling the Geneva summit in 1985 when the U.S. and Soviet leaders managed to push forward an important decision by pounding fists on the table.

Asked if he agreed with Gorbachev's optimism, Reagan said, "I'll do anything that works".

But neither Gorbachev nor Reagan revealed if they had overcome differences on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, the verification of air- and sea-launched cruise missiles and land-based ballistic missiles, the key obstacles to reaching the hoped-for accord.

In response to one question by reporters, Reagan said "We've settled on SDI," but when pressed he said, "No, no, it has never been a part of the negotiations".

According to U.S. officials, Reagan and Gorbachev, during their talks yesterday, found no agreement on the SDI program and contrary to the Soviet claims, still differed on how to count the air-launched cruise missiles.

As for land-based mobile missiles, a U.S. official said "We haven't heard a verification scheme we think will work... I would not expect closure" on the problem.

After their talks this morning, expected to focus on regional conflicts, Reagan and Gorbachev took a stroll through the Red Square where they were applauded by bystanders and tourists.

Reagan was scheduled to meet Soviet writers, filmmakers and artists at lunch time and deliver a speech at the Moscow State University.

RENMIN RIBAO On Disarmament, World Peace

HK0706050888 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 31 May 88, p 6

[Commentary by RENMIN RIBAO reporter Liu Kai-chen (0491 7030 1368): "Carry Out Disarmament Effectively, Defend World Peace"]

[Text] Special dispatch from the United Nations on 29 May—The 3d special United Nations General Assembly on the question of disarmament will be held in the headquarters of the United Nations in New York on 31 May. Apart from holding its annual conferences, the United Nations has so far held 15 special General Assemblies (including the forthcoming special General Assembly on the question of disarmament). Three of these 15 special General Assemblies were devoted to the discussion of the disarmament issue. This shows that the international community has attached great importance to the disarmament issue.

Some 124 countries have applied to attend the forthcoming special UN General Assembly on the question of disarmament. Heads of state from 25 countries will deliver speeches at the forthcoming special UN General Assembly. There will be an unprecedentedly large number of heads of state from various countries in the world attending the forthcoming special UN General Assembly. Foreign ministers from 41 countries will also attend the forthcoming UN General Assembly. The newly appointed Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen will lead a delegation to the forthcoming special UN General Assembly.

Some people say that since the United States and the Soviet Union signed a treaty on dismantling intermediate-range nuclear missiles last year and the leaders of both countries are presently holding talks on the question of reducing strategic nuclear weapons, the tension in the international situation will be eased gradually. And since the superpowers are holding direct talks on the question of reducing their respective nuclear arsenals, it seems that the international community should choose to "wait quietly for the good news to come."

It is true that the global arms race has been carried out mainly between the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, which have the largest nuclear and conventional arsenals in the world. Therefore, the United States and the Soviet Union shoulder a special responsibility on the question of disarmament. The

attitudes and actions of the two superpowers have an important bearing on whether or not disarmament can make substantial progress. However, the world's concern over the disarmament issue and the efforts made by the international community in promoting the disarmament cause should in no way be overlooked. The treaty signed between the United States and the Soviet Union on dismantling intermediate-range nuclear missiles is the first step towards a reduction of nuclear arms. Such a step should be welcomed by the entire international community. However, according to the treaty signed between the United States and the Soviet Union on dismantling intermediate-range nuclear missiles, only some 2,600 intermediate-range and short-range nuclear missiles will be dismantled, which accounts for only a small proportion of the 50,000 nuclear warheads possessed presently by the United States and the Soviet Union. Because the two superpowers still disagree over the question of reducing their respective strategic nuclear weapons by 50 percent, it is impossible for the two superpowers to reach any agreement on reducing their respective strategic nuclear weapons by 50 percent at the U.S.-USSR summit meeting currently being held in Moscow. Even if the United States and the Soviet Union reach an agreement on reducing their respective strategic nuclear weapons by 50 percent and actually implement the agreement in the future, the remaining 50 percent of the strategic nuclear weapons possessed by the United States and the Soviet Union will still be sufficient enough to destroy all of mankind because the explosive force of the remaining 50 percent of the strategic nuclear weapons possessed by the United States and the Soviet Union will still be several thousand times stronger than all the arms and munitions used in the Second World War.

Moreover, while the United States and the Soviet Union are carrying out a quantitative reduction of their respective nuclear arsenals, they are also making active efforts to improve the quality of their respective nuclear arsenals. Because the United States and the Soviet Union have been contending for nuclear superiority for many years, their respective nuclear arsenals have been overstocked for a long time. Now, both sides need to eliminate their outdated and overstocked nuclear weapons so as to concentrate their efforts on their contention for a superiority in comprehensive national strength. As far as the highly sophisticated weapons are concerned, the two superpowers will need to make greater efforts to improve the quality of their offensive strategic nuclear weapons while actively developing their outer space weapons and contending for "technological superiority." Therefore, the danger of a nuclear war still exists and world peace and safety is still being threatened seriously.

The total military expenditure in the world has reached nearly \$1,000 billion with the military expenditures of the United States, the Soviet Union, and their respective military allies accounting for 75 percent of the total. This means that while the people of many countries in the world are still struggling for existence on the verge of

poverty and hunger, mankind spends nearly \$2 million on military expenditure every minute rather than on improving people's livelihood. Such a high military expenditure has far exceeded actual needs of each country's national defense and has hindered seriously the development of the world economy. Even the United States and the Soviet Union have felt that such a burden is really too heavy for them to bear.

Therefore, in order to safeguard the interests of all the people in the world, including the interests of the American people and the Soviet people, we must press the two superpowers to stop their arms race and take the lead in reducing nuclear and conventional weapons. Just as UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar recently pointed out: "The international community must continue to press the two superpowers to continue to make joint efforts to push forward with the regional and global disarmament process." The holding of the 3d special UN General Assembly on the question of disarmament which is to be attended by heads of state of various countries in the world (including the big and small countries, nuclear and nonnuclear countries in the world) clearly manifests the world concern over the disarmament issue. The people of the world are not passively and "quietly waiting for the good news to come" but are taking action and making contributions toward safeguarding world peace and realizing a really effective global disarmament.

Disarmament Document Outlines Concrete Proposals

OW0206013688 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 0633 GMT 1 Jun 88

[By reporter Qian Wenrong]

[Text] United Nations, 31 May (XINHUA)—The Chinese delegation submitted a working document to the third United Nations General Assembly special session on disarmament today, pointing out that a new trend has emerged in the arms race between the two superpowers, characterized by its extension into outer space and the shifting to quality improvement of weapons, and stressing that the countries, which possess the largest nuclear and conventional arsenals and bear a special responsibility for disarmament, should be the first to take concrete actions to drastically reduce their arsenals.

The document also stressed that disarmament should not be monopolized by a few big powers, and all states, big or small, enjoy equal rights to participate in discussions and settlement of the disarmament issues.

The third United Nations General Assembly special session on disarmament opened at UN headquarters today. In the working document, the Chinese delegation presented concrete proposals for disarmament principles, nuclear and conventional disarmament, halt of the arms race in outer space, ban on chemical weapons, naval disarmament, trust measures, and verification.

The document said: Since the second special session on disarmament in 1982, people throughout the world have made unremitting efforts in opposing war and maintaining world peace, thereby facilitating development of the international situation in a direction favorable to peace as well as progress made in bilateral and multilateral disarmament. However, the arms race between the two superpowers is still going on and the danger of war still exists. Therefore, to halt the arms race and maintain world peace and security remains a pressing and arduous task.

Regarding nuclear disarmament, the document called on the United States and the Soviet Union to take lead in halting the testing, production, and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons and in drastically reducing and destroying nuclear weapons deployed by them inside and outside their countries. All nuclear states should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and not to use or threaten to use them against the non-nuclear weapon states and the nuclear free zones at all times and under all circumstances. On such a basis, an international convention should be concluded with the participation of all the nuclear states to ensure the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

The document said: The two superpowers also bear a special responsibility for conventional disarmament and should reach agreement as soon as possible on the drastic reduction of conventional weapons. At the same time, the conventional weapons of all countries should only serve defensive purposes and must in no way be used for aggression and intervention against other countries.

The document said: A new priority should be given to halting the arms race in outer space. The two superpowers should not test, develop, produce, or deploy space weapons and should destroy all their existing weapons of this kind.

The document called for an early convocation of an international convention to ban and destroy all chemical weapons. The United States, the Soviet Union, and all other states possessing chemical weapons should pledge not to use these weapons.

In conclusion, the document stressed that the role of the United Nations and that of multilateral disarmament machinery should be strengthened to promote and encourage all unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral disarmament efforts.

Qian Qichen Speaks at UN Disarmament Session OW0206160288 Beijing XINHUA in English 1530 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] United Nations, June 2 (XINHUA)—Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen said today that the world situation remains turbulent, but there has been some new positive development in the world situation recently.

Speaking at the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, which opened Tuesday, Qian pointed out that the arms race is still going on, peace is jeopardized and security is not ensured.

However he continued, over the years there have been increasingly strong calls from people everywhere for a halt to the arms race and for preservation of world peace.

Therefore, he said, "we believe that while the danger of war still exists, the forces for peace outgrow the factors making for war and that peace can be maintained."

He said the conclusion of the treaty on the elimination of the intermediate nuclear forces, signed by the United States and the Soviet Union in December, 1987, "has led to a certain degree of relaxation in the East-West relations."

The Chinese foreign minister also welcomed the Geneva Accords, signed in April, on the Afghan question but noted that "a series of prolonged regional conflicts continue to undermine the security of the countries concerned and threaten world peace."

He urged the Vietnamese authorities to withdraw all their troops from Kampuchea at an early date since the Soviet Union is already resolved to pull out its troops from Afghanistan.

Qian said peace and development are the two major issues of the present-day world and without a proper solution to the development issue, international peace and stability would be adversely affected.

Noting the gap between the north and the south is still widening, he called on all developed countries to pursue "far-sighted policies" and provide "necessary and reasonable" conditions for the developing countries to facilitate the latter's development.

Outlines Disarmament Goals

OW0206160688 Beijing XINHUA in English
1536 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] United Nations, June 2 (XINHUA)—Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, while noting that arms race is still going on, emphasized today that the United States and the Soviet Union are specially responsible for disarmament and should take the lead in drastically reducing their arsenals, especially their nuclear weapons.

Addressing the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, Qian warned that the application of the latest scientific and technological research findings to the development of arms is becoming a new trend in the U.S.-Soviet arms race.

Since disarmament is a major issue concerning world peace and security, Qian said, "All countries, big or small, strong or weak, should have a say and the right to take part in discussions and to raise demands and forward suggestions."

Qian summed up China's position and propositions on disarmament as follows:

As the nuclear arms race poses a general, grave threat to world peace and security, nuclear disarmament should be given top priority in the reduction of all types of armament;

The ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament is the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons;

The two superpowers that bear a special responsibility should take the lead in putting an end to the testing, manufacturing and deploying of all types of nuclear weapons and in drastically reducing and eliminating all types of nuclear weapons each of them has deployed in any region at home and abroad;

A broadly-represented international conference on nuclear disarmament should then be convened with the participation of all nuclear states to discuss steps and measures to be taken for a thorough destruction of nuclear armament;

Pending the realization of the goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons, all nuclear states undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states or nuclear-free zones;

There is also an urgent need to drastically reduce conventional armaments. The conventional armaments of all states should be used only for defense and not for aggression against other states or threat to their security;

An international convention on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons should be concluded at an early date;

An international agreement on the complete prohibition of space weapons should be concluded at an early date;

All states have the right to take part in the discussions and solution of disarmament issues on an equal footing. The legitimate interests and just demands of the small and medium-sized countries should be respected.

Qian stated that China is committed to the maintenance of world peace and interested in the attainment of disarmament. China is opposed to the arms race and never takes part in it, he added.

China, he noted, has not only actively put forward proposals, but put them into practice. It had voluntarily decided to reduce its troops by one million and the troop reduction was already completed last year, he added.

He said that the proportion of China's national defense expenditure in the state budget has dropped from 17.5 percent in 1979 to eight percent in 1988, and its current military expenditure totals about 5.5 billion U.S. dollars, about five dollars per person.

"I think that this simple figure is a most telling argument," he said.

Text of Speech

OW0306052788 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1549 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] United Nations, 2 Jun (XINHUA)—Addressing the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament today, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen reiterated that the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are specially responsible for disarmament and should take the lead in drastically reducing their arsenals, especially their nuclear weapons. In his speech, Qian Qichen also talked about the international situation, regional conflicts, and China's policy on disarmament.

Qian Qichen said: The arms race is still going on in the world today, and the danger of war still exists. However, the world peoples call for stopping the arms race and protecting world peace has become stronger and stronger. The forces of peace are surpassing the factors of war, and so we are capable of maintaining peace.

Qian Qichen continued: Since the first special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament in 1978, the movement to promote disarmament has become a powerful force in protecting peace. Effective ways for disarmament have been found, and some actual progress has been achieved. Qian Qichen hoped that the United States and the Soviet Union would seriously observe and implement the INF treaty signed by the two countries last December. He also hoped that the two countries would make further progress on the road of reducing strategic nuclear weapons and other types of nuclear weapons.

Qian Qichen added: The progress made in the field of disarmament is just a beginning and the tasks for promoting disarmament are still very arduous. The INF treaty signed by the United States and the Soviet Union only covers 3 to 4 percent of their total arsenals of nuclear weapons. Even if they reduce their strategic nuclear weapons by 50 percent, the remaining nuclear weapons they possess can still destroy the world several times over.

He said: Besides nuclear weapons, the question of totally banning chemical weapons must also be solved as soon as possible, and the reduction in conventional arms is also a problem that must not be overlooked.

Qian Qichen emphatically pointed out that in order to realize disarmament, the arms race must first be stopped. Nevertheless, the arms race is still continuing at the moment. The arms race between the two superpowers is undergoing an important change; that is, reducing the quantity while raising the quality of weapons. The application of the latest scientific and technological research findings to the development [fa zhan 4099 1455] of advanced weapons is becoming a new trend in the arms race between the two countries.

While emphasizing the special responsibility of the two superpowers for disarmament, Qian Qichen pointed out that all countries, big or small, strong or weak, should have a say and the right to take part in discussions and to raise demands and put forward suggestions on the question of disarmament.

Foreign Minister Qian Qichen then briefly introduced China's persistent position and propositions on disarmament as follows:

Nuclear disarmament should be given top priority in the reduction of all types of armaments.

The ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament is the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons.

The two superpowers that bear a special responsibility should take the lead in putting an end to the testing, manufacturing, and deploying of all types of nuclear weapons and in drastically reducing and eliminating all types of nuclear weapons each of them have deployed. An international conference on nuclear disarmament should then be convened with the participation of all nuclear states to discuss steps and measures to be taken for a thorough destruction of nuclear armaments.

Pending the realization of the goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons, China hopes that all countries that possess nuclear weapons will assume the responsibility of not being the first to use nuclear weapons and not to use nuclear weapons against states without nuclear weapons or against nuclear-free zones.

There is also an urgent need to drastically reduce conventional armaments. The conventional armaments of all states should be used only for defense and not for aggression against other states or to threaten their security.

An international convention on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons should be concluded at an early date.

An international agreement on the complete prohibition of space weapons should be concluded at an early date.

All states in the world have the right to take part in the discussions and solution of disarmament issues on an equal footing. The legitimate interests and just demands of the small and medium-sized countries should be respected.

In his speech, Qian Qichen also touched on the issue of regional conflicts. He said: Currently, a series of regional conflicts which have lasted a long time are undermining the security of those countries involved and are threatening peace in the world. He expressed welcome to the Geneva agreement on the Afghan issue signed not long ago and called on the Vietnamese authorities to make their decision as quickly as possible and totally withdraw their troops from Cambodia.

Qian Qichen said: The Chinese Government is convinced that peace and development are the two major subjects of the contemporary world. The problem of development, if it is not properly solved, will seriously influence world peace and stability. He called on the developed countries to provide necessary and reasonable conditions for the developing countries and help them develop so as to reduce the gap between the South and the North.

Qian Qichen stated: "China is opposed to the arms race and never takes part in it." He pointed out: China is committed to the maintenance of world peace and interested in the attainment of disarmament. China has not only actively put forward proposals but has put them into practice. China has carried out its decision to reduce its troops by 1 million, and the troop reduction has already been completed. The proportion of China's national defense expenditure in the state budget has dropped from 17.5 percent in 1979 to 8 percent in 1988. China's current military expenditure totals about \$5.5 billion, or about \$5 per person.

In conclusion, Foreign Minister Qian said: "We are convinced that peace can be maintained and the goal of disarmament can be realized. The science and technology created by the people should bring benefit to mankind instead of destroying mankind."

Lack of Progress at Moscow Summit Noted
OW0306100488 Beijing in Russian to the USSR
1100 GMT 1 Jun 88

["International Affairs Review" program]

[Text] Commenting on the first conversations between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Moscow, a XINHUA correspondent writes: Representatives of the two countries declared at a press conference that the Gorbachev-Reagan talks had passed in a businesslike spirit and helped increase mutual understanding of one another's positions, while progress was achieved in several specific problems.

However, judging by public statements of the leaders of the two countries and statements by representatives of both sides at briefings, during the first 2 days the talks passed in a fairly austere [strogy] atmosphere, while on certain important problems, sharp contradictions continue to remain between the two sides.

There are three reasons this impression was formed by observers. First of all, the Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed to the United States that a treaty on reducing strategic offensive arms be concluded as soon as possible. However at the Kremlin meeting, Reagan—referring to the Russian saying: It was born, it was not rushed—replied that he is not in a hurry. Of course this remark by Reagan grates on Moscow. Later, in his reply to the question: What do you think about the saying President Reagan used in his speech, Gorbachev said: I always favor movement, however I prefer another proverb: Trust but verify. This refined war of proverbs shows that Reagan wants to solve important problems of U.S.-USSR relations step-by-step, without haste, while Gorbachev, as his partner, ("does not intend") to make compromises.

Second, on the first day of the talks Reagan raised the issue of human rights. White House representative Fitzwater considers the human rights issue to be of particular significance, while Soviet representative Gennadiy Gerasimov said: The fact that the U.S. side has raised this issue carries with it elements of propaganda and sensationalism. Besides these sharp words, Reagan received a group of Soviet dissidents at his residence. At the same time, the Soviet side, not yielding to the Americans, held a special press conference for four American Indians who came to Moscow with the aim of demanding human rights from Reagan. These mutual attacks over the human rights issue do not correspond with the atmosphere in which the meeting passed during the first 2 days.

Third, people are concerned with what progress has been achieved on the issue of arms reduction, which was the primary topic of talks on mutual relations during the first 2 days of the meeting. It has been reported that the position of both sides on the issue of control and verification of mobile intercontinental missiles has changed considerably, and that progress has been achieved on the issue of control of air-launched cruise missiles, on mutual notification about the launching of intercontinental missiles, and on establishment of limits on the verification of chemical weapons. However there has been no change in the considerable differences on the main obstacles at the talks on a 50-percent reduction in nuclear arms. For example, on the issue of adhering to the ABM treaty concluded in 1972, on space weapons, and on sea-launched cruise missiles.

Herein lies the stumbling block at the present meeting impeding the signing of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in nuclear arms, despite the fact that both leaders have repeatedly expressed a desire to sign this treaty during the current term of office of President Reagan.

RENMIN RIBAO on Strategic Arms Talks
*HK0106060788 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO Overseas
Edition in Chinese 1 Jun 88 p 6*

["Newsletter from the Soviet Union" by RENMIN RIBAO Reporter Zhang Qixin (1728 0796 2500) and Zhou Xiangguang (0719 6272 0342) dispatched from Moscow on 30 May: "It Is So Near and Yet Inaccessible—the USSR-U.S. Strategic Arms Treaty Under Discussion"]

[Text] According to the plan of the last Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington last December, the two countries would sign the treaty on reducing their strategic weapons by 50 percent when the two leaders met in Moscow this time. However, the drafting of the treaty made very slow progress and, for various reasons, has not yet been completed.

On 29 May, at the first meeting of the two leaders, Gorbachev and Reagan analyzed the achievements and remaining problems in bilateral relations. According to a spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry, the issue of security is a main part of the talks between the two leaders. Now, four working groups have been set up to study various issues concerned, including the issue of arms control.

At the welcome ceremony in the Kremlin Palace, Gorbachev indicated that an unshirkable duty for the Soviet Union and the United States is to carry out constructive discussions on various major aspects of disarmament, including the series of issues concerning the reduction of strategic weapons by 50 percent. Gorbachev even told reporters that it is completely possible for the Soviet and U.S. leaders to hold their fifth summit meeting in order to complete the formulation of the strategic arms treaty.

Reagan quoted a Russian proverb: "It was born, it wasn't rushed." However, he also said that the present draft of the treaty not only records the common points but also reflects the questions that have yet to be solved. In some background materials given to the press, the White House also acknowledged that although the task is arduous, it is still possible to conclude the treaty on reducing strategic weapons this year.

This shows that although the current summit meeting participants cannot sign the treaty according to the previous schedule, both sides are still striving for the target of concluding the treaty through continuing talks.

Reducing strategic weapons is a major topic in the Soviet-U.S. arms control talks over the past 3 years and more, and this has become the focus of the two countries' talks since the INF treaty was signed last December. From the materials provided for the press by the two countries, these reporters feel that the Soviet Union and the United States are seeking a way to reduce their

nuclear weapons, not only because they are being prompted by the international community's strong demand on nuclear disarmament, but also because they both need to do so.

Through the expansion in nuclear armaments over the past 10 years and more, the strategic nuclear arsenals of both the Soviet Union and the United States have reached a saturation point. According to the data published by the Soviet Union, up to January 1988, the Soviet Union and the United States respectively possessed 2,494 and 2,260 strategic-weapon carriers and respectively possessed 10,000 and 14,000 warheads. Both sides are aware that they need not maintain a posture of nuclear confrontation at such a high level and should cut down on their nuclear arsenals according to a certain rate so as to maintain a balance of nuclear strength at a lower level. This will lighten the military expenditure burdens on both sides, and is obviously in line with their own interests.

In fact, through negotiations over the past year or so, the two countries have basically drawn up the outline of strategic arms reductions for the next few years, and the main points are as follows:

First, both sides agree to reduce the number of their respective carriers for delivering strategic weapons to 1,600 and reduce the number of their respective warheads to 6,000.

Second, both sides agree to limit the number of continental missiles and submarine-launched missiles to 4,900, and limit the number of heavy missile warheads to 1,540.

Third, both sides agree to formulate three strategic weapons verification documents on the basis of the verification principles in the INF treaty.

However, the two sides have not yet reached agreement on such an initial arms reduction treaty. Some analysts who have been following the arms talks said that strategic nuclear weapons constitute the main pillar for the military strength of both countries, so neither of them is willing to make any ready concession on this issue.

Another reason is that the two big nuclear powers have different strategic nuclear weapons structures, so it is hard for them to work out an arms reduction plan which can maintain the balance of strength between the two sides.

Moreover, although both sides have indicated that they will not try to seek any unilateral superiority, it is still undeniable that in the talks, they always tried to impose more limitations on the other side and leave more room for maneuvering for themselves. Now, most of the differences over the arms reduction treaty are more and less related to this factor.

According to the information provided by the Soviet and American officials to the press, the differences center around five points. For example, the United States holds that the land-based continental missiles are most dangerous and most unstable weapons, so it demands that the number of warheads carried by such missiles should be strictly limited. The United States also holds that it is not easy to verify the mobile land-based missiles of the Soviet Union, so such missiles should also be banned. However, land-based missiles constitute the main part of the strategic nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union. So the Soviet Union holds that it is not fair to merely consider one side's interests and neglect the other side's interests. On the contrary, the U.S. nuclear force based on sea or air is superior to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union holds that the number of warheads carried by sea-based missiles and the number of cruise missiles carried by bombers should be limited.

In addition, the United States possesses a large number of sea-based long-range cruise missiles which can carry both nuclear warheads and conventional warheads. The warheads carried by these missiles are not included in the total limit of 6,000 warheads. The Soviet Union is happy about this, and demands that such cruise missiles should also be subject to limitation and supervision, but the United States does not agree with this.

As for verification, because there is a large variety and a large number of strategic weapons which are spread widely, many of them carrying multiple warheads, the difficulty and complicatedness of verifying such weapons is much greater than verifying the medium-range missiles. This is also a major obstacle to the formulation of the treaty on strategic nuclear weapons.

Since the strategic arms treaty has not been drafted, what noticeable achievements will the two leaders make at their Moscow meeting? It seems that they will not be satisfied with merely talking about human rights, bilateral relations, and regional conflicts. The issue of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, as a sign of the improvement of U.S.-Soviet relations, has already been solved in the Geneva talks. So, even if the two sides cannot sign the treaty on reducing the strategic weapons, will they make progress in settling some substantial issues so as to pave the way for the conclusion of the treaty? This is a question that attracts the attention of the large number of reporters from various countries in Moscow.

Not long ago, Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze said that the top-level meeting is not the ultimate goal of action, but is a major stage on the way leading to the conclusion of a new treaty. This seems that the two countries are trying to seek a way leading to the conclusion of the treaty through the current summit meeting. So now people can wait and see the results.

START Accord Unlikely During Reagan Term
OW 0206080888 Beijing XINHUA in English
0629 GMT 2 Jun 88

[“News Analysis: Summit Dims Prospects for START Accord (by Shen Yiming)” — XINHUA headline]

[Text] Moscow, June 2 (XINHUA)—Summit watchers have been struck by statements by superpower leaders which may reveal slimmer chances for achieving a Strategic Nuclear Arms (START) accord before U.S. President Ronald Reagan leaves office next January.

As expected, no major breakthroughs in arms control came out of the four rounds of talks in Moscow between Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan. The two sides were sparring over two main issues that are blocking a START accord—Star Wars and verification.

Contrary to earlier somewhat rosy statements about achieving a strategic arms pact, it appears that both sides are now pessimistic on the prospects of reaching an accord soon, an indication that such a treaty could hardly be signed in the less than eight months left of Reagan's term.

At a news conference following the two leaders' fourth and final round of talks, Gorbachev said the Star Wars program, formally known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, constitutes a highly destabilizing element.

At a separate press conference, Reagan said he is not sure whether a START treaty halving Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear arsenals could be reached within his term of office.

Reagan said the United States views verification of strategic weapons as one of the most important and difficult issues.

The President said the START treaty is infinitely more complex than the INF treaty but that there will be continued negotiation on it. He said he hopes that his successor will continue the talks if no agreement is reached while he is in the White House.

Gorbachev also deemed it imperative to maintain contacts with Reagan's successor in negotiations over their disagreements.

Both sides reported progress on verification but remain tight-lipped about details, and this, according to observers, conveys impression that the issue is likely to be inherited by the next U.S. President.

The upshot of the four rounds of talks shows that arms control remains a pivotal issue, even though it was not on the summit agenda and seemed somewhat overshadowed by human rights issues.

One positive aspect appeared to be that despite the absence of major arms control breakthroughs, both sides appeared willing to adopt restrained and businesslike approaches toward their differences over some major problems and avoided head-on confrontations.

They did engage in exchanges of bitter rhetoric, yet they exhibited restraint to insure that their dialogue didn't lose momentum.

The two leaders apparently evinced less interest in regional conflicts, one of the topics on the summit agenda, and this was attributed by observers to the fact that the Geneva accords providing for a Soviet pullout from Afghanistan made this a less contentious issue.

Gorbachev said only that he and Reagan discussed "in depth" the Afghanistan issue, and he stressed without elaboration the practicality of resolving it through political means and on the basis of "balance interests."

Reagan also gave a generalized account by saying he and Gorbachev agreed that the problem should be solved through peaceful means, and that solutions following the Afghan pattern can be applied to other regions. It is not clear whether there is a secret understanding on the problem.

Human rights issues tended to gain prominence when Reagan appeared to try to highlight them to embarrass the Soviets. However, Moscow's spokesmen, though annoyed by Reagan's maneuvers, seemed well poised and on occasions took the offensive.

Gorbachev said the U.S. Administration "does not have a real understanding" of human rights problems and the process of democratization taking place in the Soviet Union today.

In a joint statement issued later, the two leaders mentioned the possible establishment of a forum which will meet regularly to review human rights problems in both countries.

The two countries reached only several minor agreements in bilateral relations, another topic at the summit.

Obviously, due to the complexities of a START treaty, the two superpowers had not realistically expected to strike a deal at the Moscow summit. However, they certainly appear ready to continue their dialogue while continuing to differ over major issues.

And their battle for their strategic interests will also go on unchecked.

XINHUA Analyzes U.S.-Soviet Summit
OW0206163888 Beijing XINHUA in English
1605 GMT 2 Jun 88

[*"News Analysis: A Summit With Progress, But Not Much by Yuan Renzheng"*—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Moscow, June 2 (XINHUA)—Ronald Reagan has come and left. He held four rounds of talks with Mikhail Gorbachev, had a sensational meeting with Soviet dissidents and refuseniks, talked to the supposedly liberal-minded cultural community, preached American democracy to young students, and imitated his Moscow host's public relations act from last year's Washington summit: a casual walk outside the Kremlin chatting with people in the street.

So now, after all of these ostensibly animated engagements—to the likes and dislikes of his Moscow host—a key question remains. What have the American president and Soviet leader accomplished in Moscow that might have an immediate or long-term impact on the U.S.-Soviet relationship?

No one, neither Reagan nor Gorbachev, has ever described the Moscow meeting as "successful". A brief look at what has happened here testifies to the conclusion that certain progress has been made on arms control and bilateral relations, that major differences remain unresolved, and that both sides hope to keep the momentum of the dialogue they initiated in Geneva less than three years ago at the highest level.

The most spectacular achievement in arms control is perhaps the exchange of documents ratifying the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty which will make the destruction of all their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles a reality.

The signing of two accords on notification of launches of powerful intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missiles and on joint verification of nuclear test experiments are also something new. The former is designed to reduce the risks of nuclear accidents, and the latter is necessary to ratify the 1974 Threshold Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty.

As for the crucial 50-percent cut in strategic offensive nuclear arms, progress is reported only in the most general terms. The two leaders basically reaffirmed what they had agreed upon in Washington last December and indicated their readiness to carry on the Geneva negotiations so that a strategic arms reduction treaty (START) can be signed "without delay" as soon as the remaining differences are resolved.

But how soon can the two sides iron out the numerous disagreements in the joint draft of the START treaty and the draft texts of three related documents on inspection, arms elimination and data exchange? The two leaders did not offer a clear-cut guideline.

In fact, nobody had expected the Moscow summit to produce something dramatic on the 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear arsenals. True, the START treaty is much more complex than the INF treaty. But political will sometimes plays a decisive role in matters of this nature. Such will was not visible throughout the Moscow meeting.

With less than eight months to go before he leaves office and in the face of growing concerns in American military circles over the 50-percent cut, Reagan is simply in no mood to rush a START treaty. "It was born, it wasn't rushed." This Russian proverb Reagan quoted in his arrival speech in Moscow may serve as a clue to his approach on the strategic arms issue in the Moscow talks. So, he did all he could to turn his Moscow trip into an evangelist's crusade on human rights.

Gorbachev, aware of Reagan's attitude and perhaps with an eye to the next U.S. president, may also have decided not to press his guest too hard on the arms reduction issue.

So, while Reagan was making a big fuss over human rights, Gorbachev demonstrated an amazing tolerance. He listened, allowed his U.S. guest to preach at various occasions, and then told him straightforwardly that they disagreed with each other on the matter.

"Our dialogue has not been easy, but we have mustered enough realism and political will to overcome differences and to divert the train of the Soviet-U.S. relations from a dangerous tack to a safer one," the Soviet leader said. "It has, however, so far been moving much more slowly than is required by the real situation, both in our two countries and in the whole world."

These remarks of Gorbachev at this morning's farewell ceremony may well serve as a proper summary of the spirit of the Moscow summit: Both sides want to continue their dialogue, but the desired results still seem beyond their reach.

XINHUA 'Commentary' Views U.S.-Soviet Summit

OW0206190888 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 0533 GMT 2 Jun 88

["Commentary: While the Momentum of Dialogue Is Maintained, Strife Remains Acute" by XINHUA reporter Shen Yiming]

[Text] Moscow, 1 June (XINHUA)—The four rounds of talks scheduled for the Soviet-U.S. summit concluded today. The result of these talks indicated that the summit

failed to solve any major questions concerning strategic arms reduction, the focal point of the negotiations, but both sides showed a certain degree of restraint and a businesslike approach. Despite their "sharp" clashes on some issues of major differences, both tried to avoid a head-on confrontation. Both wanted to keep the momentum of the dialogue.

The agenda for this summit did not include the signing of a treaty for a 50-percent reduction of strategic weapons, nor was it taken as the goal of this summit to reach agreement on other major issues. During the summit, however, the test of strength between the two sides centered on such questions as arms control and especially on strategic weapon reduction. At a press conference following the talks, Gorbachev criticized the U.S. "Star Wars program" as "a highly unstabilizing element." Reagan stressed in his own press conference that the United States views verification of strategic weapons as "one of the most important and difficult issues." Both sides said that the summit had "made progress" on the question of verification, but did not reveal what progress had actually been made.

The rhetoric of both sides before the end of the summit and the joint statement they issued after the summit give people this striking impression: Although possibilities exist for the solution of the longstanding, large, and difficult problems presently confronting strategic weapon reduction negotiations and for the signing of such a treaty within the half-year before the end of the Reagan administration's term, it cannot be perceived at this time that the two sides have made a political decision to sign the treaty within the above-mentioned period. On this issue, their voices have become increasingly low-pitched. At today's press conference, Reagan dropped a hint by saying that the solution of these questions "requires long-term negotiations," adding that if no agreement is reached during his term of office, he hopes that "his successor will continue this task." Gorbachev also deemed it "very imperative" to meet with the next president of the United States. As can be seen, the relay baton for the 50 percent cut of strategic weapons will be passed on to the next U.S. president.

At the summit, the U.S. side intentionally used the so-called human rights issue to exert pressure on the Soviet side. Giving tit for tat, the Soviet side tried to hit the American sore spot in this respect. We may say that after they had quarreled with each other, basically the game ended in a draw.

Observers here had expected that some prospects could appear for the solution of one or two questions on the issue of regional conflicts as a result of the two leaders' talks during the summit. However, Gorbachev merely said that the two sides had discussed the issue of regional conflicts "in the greatest depth," but without further elaboration on the result of the discussion. Whether a tacit agreement was reached at the talks between the two

sides is unknown. Gorbachev only stressed the "practicality" of resolving regional issues through political means and on the basis of "balanced interests." Also, Reagan merely gave a generalized account by saying that he and Gorbachev had agreed that regional conflicts should be settled by "peaceful means" and admitted that the method for solving the Afghan issue may be applied to other regions.

During this summit, while admitting the existence of serious differences on a number of major issues, both sides grasped the banner of developing dialogue and cooperation. The joint statement views the summit as "a major step" to lay "a more fruitful and firmer foundation" for Soviet-U.S. relations. In addition to two minor arms control agreements, seven bilateral cooperative agreements were signed during the summit. Both leaders expressed determination to promote economic and trade relations and expand the exchange of personnel so as to increase mutual understanding.

Viewed as a whole, due to the relatively complicated questions of limits for various weapons and of verification involved in the issue of strategic weapon reduction, and because of the subjective as well as objective restricting factors in both the Soviet Union and the United States, neither of the two sides had pinned too much hope on the Moscow summit as a way to solve major questions. What they wanted was to continue to keep the momentum of their dialogue. It can be affirmed that their battle for strategic interests will go on while they are continuing their dialogue.

XINHUA 'News Analysis' on Summit

OW0306203388 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1151 GMT 3 Jun 88

["News Analysis: A Meeting That Serves as a Connecting Link between the Past and the Future" by reporter Shen Yiming—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jun (XINHUA)—U.S. President Reagan has left Moscow for home today after winding up his 5-day meeting with Soviet leader Gorbachev. Thousands of reporters who came here to cover this summit are also leaving. Observers who have followed this summit are carefully pondering these questions: How should this summit be assessed? What will be its impact on the development of Soviet-U.S. relations?

Certainly, the Moscow summit did not produce any result that can be described as a "major breakthrough," compared with the three preceding meetings. The 1985 Geneva meeting broke the Soviet-U.S. stalemate that had lasted for 6 years and opened a path for reinstating dialogue and prompting arms control negotiations. The 1986 Iceland summit, though stalled by the differences on the question of space weapons, laid groundwork for the subsequent nuclear arms reduction talks. The 1987 Washington summit produced a treaty for the total destruction of intermediate-range missiles, opening the

first page in the history of disarmament on the genuine reduction of nuclear weapons. At most, however, what the Moscow summit accomplished in the area of arms control was the exchange of instruments ratifying the intermediate-range nuclear treaty, which the two leaders had signed 5 months ago, an accord on joint verification of underground nuclear test experiments, which the two sides had agreed upon at the end of last year, and an accord on notification of launches of intercontinental and submarine-launched missiles. With respect to bilateral relations, some agreements were signed on cultural exchange and scientific and technological cooperation. It is, of course, worth welcoming that the two highly competitive opponents can reach some agreements in the areas of armament and bilateral relations, even though they are not important agreements. Regarding such major issues as space weapons and strategic arms reduction, however, serious differences remain between the two sides despite the fact that their positions have become somewhat closer in certain less important areas.

Of course, it would be unfair not to give due attention to the Moscow summit because it produced no major breakthrough. An analysis of the background of the Moscow summit may assist us in making an objective assessment of this meeting.

The Soviet Union and the United States held four summit meetings in 3 years, in Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, and Moscow respectively. This produced the initial change in the state of serious confrontation. After acute negotiation, the two sides finally signed and officially put into effect a treaty for destroying an entire class of nuclear weapons—intermediate- and short-range missiles. They also prompted the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan. Now the Soviet Union has begun to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan, resulting in improved Soviet-U.S. relations, to a certain extent. Out of their different strategic interests, both the Soviet Union and the United States want to see that this trend is maintained.

As can be seen from this summit, the Soviet Union focused its attention on maintaining the momentum of dialogue with the United States and formulating basic principles on the relations between the two countries and on some major international issues, so as to lay groundwork for dealing with the next U.S. president. The Soviet Union hoped to create a favorable international situation so that it may concentrate its efforts on facing the rigorous challenges before it. The U.S. side did not significantly change its basic strategy and principle in dealing with the Soviet Union. However, because of its considerable difficulties at home and abroad and in consideration of the general election, the United States had to adjust its Soviet policy by incorporating a certain degree of "realism" so as to ease the relations between the two countries.

It was in front of such a background that the Moscow summit became a connecting link between the past and the future by consolidating the progress already made

while continuing the dialogue. The joint statement issued in the wake of the summit gives people a deep convincing impression about this. First, the statement reaffirms the fundamental beliefs that the two leaders put forth at the last summit, namely: "There could be no winner in a nuclear war," "at no time should a nuclear war be started," and "it is determined to prevent any war between the Soviet Union and the United States." Second, the statement stresses the vital significance of developing dialogue, saying that it is necessary to view the dialogue as "a constructive basis for solving the problems for today, tomorrow, and 100 years to come." The reiteration of the above two points in the statement indicates that both the Soviet and the U.S., out of their different strategic considerations, want to compete with each other under the condition of maintaining a relatively alleviated tension. Under these circumstances, the fundamental thinking affirmed by the Moscow summit will have a positive impact on Soviet-U.S. relations for some time to come, provided that there is no major change in the strategy on both sides.

It should be noted, of course, that differences between the two countries are intensive, the lack of sufficient confidence in each other has not been eliminated, and the arms race has not come to a halt. It has been revealed that Gorbachev has proposed to Reagan several measures for peaceful coexistence of the two countries and suggested that they be included in the joint statement. At first Reagan agreed to this suggestion, but later it was vetoed by other American representatives. Gorbachev said that during the last round of talks, he and Reagan argued sharply on the wording of the joint statement. This shows the seriousness of the Soviet-U.S. differences. As can be seen, since it is hard to reconcile the conflict between the fundamental interests of the Soviet Union and the United States, even if dialogue can be continued, their keen struggle will continue, sometimes seriously and sometimes less so. Blind optimism will be groundless.

Russian-Language Radio Beam's View
OW0406152888 Beijing in Russian to the USSR
1800 GMT 3 Jun 88

[*"International Events Review"* program; correspondent (Hung Bo)]

[Text] The Moscow meeting between the CPSU general secretary and the U.S. president is over. Both sides consider the meeting successful. They expressed satisfaction with the result. Although progress was achieved at the meeting there were no important breakthroughs, as was expected beforehand. The United States and USSR finally, on the eve of the meeting, ratified the INF treaty, thus securing the exchange of ratification documents and (?completing) its implementation. The signing of the INF treaty is an essential step by the USSR and United

States on a long path to disarmament and it is (?worthy) of hailing. Implementation of this treaty will allow mankind to rid itself of the threat of one entire class of nuclear arms.

However, as has been widely noted, the number of intermediate-range missiles subject to destruction represent only 4 percent of the two countries' nuclear stockpiles. If the two sides do not progress and do not achieve an agreement on a considerable reduction of strategic offensive arms, the significance of the INF treaty will be limited.

In the course of the meeting, the leaders of the two countries discussed this question but their views differed substantially. Reagan expressed hope for overcoming the differences before the end of this year, and for development of an agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic nuclear stockpiles of the two countries. Gorbachev, in his turn, also expressed readiness to move step-by-step toward such a treaty.

Naturally, the rest of the world all the more wishes the United States and USSR, the states having the largest nuclear stockpiles, to proceed from common interests of mankind, actually fulfill their special responsibility for disarmament, sign the 50-percent reduction of strategic nuclear arms as early as possible, then proceed toward reduction of the remaining halves of their nuclear stockpiles.

During the meeting, Gorbachev and Reagan also discussed regional conflicts in Afghanistan, the Middle East, Cambodia, the Korean peninsula, Central America and South Africa. It is reported that the central contradictions in these questions were not eliminated. Numerous and protracted regional conflicts are not beneficial to the cause of world peace and stability. This is why the peoples of the world always oppose the interference of great powers into regional conflicts and support their political settlement, the end of aggression, withdrawal of foreign troops, and respect of sovereignty of each state.

The USSR has now started the withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan. Let us hope that the USSR, being a supporter of the SRV, will prompt the latter to an earlier withdrawal of troops from Cambodia and not limit itself to verbiage.

In the course of the Moscow meeting an argument arose about human rights. The White House representative emphasized that the question of human rights has a special significance, and the USSR representative bitingly responded that the U.S. declaration contains propagandist and demagogical elements. This episode showed disagreement between the United States and USSR, who achieved only superficial accord.

Speaking on the present summit meeting, Gorbachev said that his talks with Reagan laid a foundation for further USSR-U.S. relations, with new development of the USSR-U.S. dialogue being one of the main results of this meeting.

Of course we welcome this dialogue, because improvement of USSR-U.S. relations undoubtedly promotes the relaxation of international tension

RENMIN RIBAO Overseas 'Commentary'
HK0406060788 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO Overseas
Edition in Chinese 4 Jun 88 p 6

["Commentary" from Moscow by correspondents Zhang Qixin (1728 0796 2500) and Zhou Xiangguang (0719 6272 0342): "Maintain the Momentum of Dialogue—Commenting on the Moscow Soviet-U.S. Summit"]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. summit concluded in Moscow after 4 days of intense talks. During the summit a Soviet-U.S. joint declaration was issued, instruments ratifying the INF Treaty were exchanged, and nine agreements concerning arms control and bilateral relations were signed. On the whole, this was a meeting to explore further detente and to work out new rules for dialogue. During the talks, both sides strove to maintain a good and harmonious atmosphere and endeavored to show the world a new tone in U.S.-Soviet relations.

The strategic weapons treaty remained an important topic in their talks. In their joint declaration the two sides detailed the common points reached after talks held during the past year or so and held that these common points will be the basis for future treaties. The two sides also decided that the Geneva talks will be continued from the middle of July this year and that if a treaty on cutting strategic weapons by 50 percent can be agreed in the coming few months, it will be signed immediately.

The two sides still hold different views on the question of the antiballistic missile treaty. During the meeting, the two sides did not argue much and only demanded that a separate agreement should be reached through talks on the basis of the wording of the joint declaration issued at last year's Washington meeting. At a press conference on conclusion of the summit, Gorbachev said that on the one hand, arms on earth are controlled and on the other, the U.S. strategic defense initiative demands the deployment of arms in outer space. This is illogical. However, a White House spokesman said on another occasion that the U.S. strategic defense initiative and the reduction of strategic arms supplement one another.

Foreign journalists here held that the summit has not made the anticipated major breakthrough on the issue of arms control. Although the Soviet-U.S. joint declaration mentioned certain progress, most of this progress is confined to principles of intention and lacks substantive content. This reflects the two sides' desire to reach an

agreement on strategic weapons. It also reflects that their differences cannot be settled for the time being and that future talks will remain arduous.

Regarding regional issues, the two heads of state made positive appraisals at the meeting of the Geneva Agreement on a political solution to the Afghan issue and held that the agreement will have a good influence on the settlement of other regional issues. In the joint declaration, the two sides have said that in principle that they will jointly take constructive actions and will continue to hold a dialogue to help solve regional conflict in a peaceful way. This seems to show that the Soviet Union and the United States will endeavor to relax regional tension in their own interests while avoiding direct conflicts.

During the summit the two sides found the human rights issue rather knotty as they crossed swords. This was unexpected. During their talks, and on many other occasions, President Reagan mentioned the human rights issue. He said that the United States regards the human rights issue as an important factor in improving U.S.-Soviet relations. Gorbachev also stated on different occasions that both the Soviet Union and the United States have their own value concepts and that one should not interfere in the affairs of others, lecture others, or impose one's views on others. However, such crossing of swords did not have an impact on the major orientation of the summit.

The Moscow summit has attracted worldwide attention. Although the concrete results of the meeting are not very prominent the media here universally held that under the present circumstances, the significance of the Moscow meeting between the Soviet and U.S. heads of state itself exceeds that of the documents signed, and the meeting occupies a certain position in Soviet-U.S. relations during the 1980's.

First, the summit has maintained the momentum of Soviet-U.S. dialogue over the past 3 years. Leaders of the two countries fully affirmed the four meetings held since November 1985. They believed that these meetings have resulted in the initial change in the relations between the two countries from confrontation to dialogue and, are conducive to attaining a new level of mutual understanding.

Second, the Moscow summit is also a continuation and development of the previous three meetings. The Geneva summit meeting put forward the targets for U.S.-Soviet relations in the present stage including stepping up dialogue, curbing confrontation, promoting talks, cutting armaments, reducing conflicts, and strengthening stability. The momentum for cutting nuclear arms appeared at the Reykjavik meeting and the INF treaty was signed at the Washington meeting. Although the treaty on a 50 percent reduction in strategic weapons was not signed at the recent summit, the determination to make efforts to conclude such a treaty was reiterated.

and the expansion of political dialogue to settle issues of common concern was put forward. This tendency has been positively assessed by the people.

However, both the Soviet Union and the United States, two big countries, admitted that serious fundamental differences remain between them. During the meeting the two leaders stated that it was necessary to solve existing and future problems through dialogue on a realistic basis. Viewed from the angle of future Soviet-U.S. relations the two sides will continue to hold dialogue and avoid serious confrontation.

CHINA DAILY Comments

HK0406022088 Beijing CHINA DAILY in English
4 Jun 88 p 4

[By CHINA DAILY commentator: "Moscow Summit"]

[Text] The United States and the Soviet Union have just concluded another summit meeting in Moscow, the fourth in 30 months. The high frequency of such meetings in the last four years indicates that both superpowers have a strong desire to improve strained relations through negotiations. This is a good thing in itself, for political dialogue is after all preferable to stubborn confrontation.

This summit had few concrete achievements to its credit. On the human rights issue, one of the topics on the agenda, there was only much rhetoric and sparring stemming from each sides' domestic consideration. And judging from the information in the joint statement, there was no significant progress in settling regional conflicts.

The central theme of the summit, to all intents and purposes, was the arms control issue, a most important question that has gravely concerned people all over the world since the end of World War II.

Unlike its predecessor, the Washington summit of half year ago, which witnessed the signing of the intermediate nuclear forces treaty, this one was by and large marked by the official exchange of protocol, which nevertheless is important.

With the INF treaty coming into force, preparation measures to dismantle the intermediate and shorter-range nuclear missiles are underway. And upon the completion of the whole procedure in three years, a whole class of nuclear missiles will be wiped out—the first time in the history of disarmament negotiations.

The people of the world are somewhat relieved to see that the Moscow summit continued the trend for dialogue between East and West.

But they are far from satisfied when it ended without a breakthrough in the talks on a treaty cutting by half the strategic offensive nuclear arsenals of both superpowers, which the summit was previously intended for.

Coincidental or not, while the two were holding their talks, the United Nations opened its third special session on disarmament. At this forum, representatives from various nations, big and small, again urged genuine disarmament and the elimination of the danger of a world war. If the same approach had prevailed at the summit meeting, people would have expected no delay on an early agreement for a drastic nuclear arms cut.

And, for the UN forum, people noted the warning by Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen that while reducing the quantities of arms, the superpowers are shifting their emphasis in the arms race to better quality, making use of the latest science and technology.

A thaw in East-West relations and continuation of dialogue are welcomed, but people will not relax their vigilance while the superpowers are still making tremendous efforts to develop more effective means of war.

RENMIN RIBAO Commentators Article

HK0506080888 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese
5 Jun 88 p 6

[Commentator's article: "Commenting on the Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting"]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow has ended. Taking an overall view of this meeting, the two sides discussed disarmament, regional conflicts, human rights, and bilateral relations, exchanged instruments of ratification on the INF treaty, and signed two agreements on disarmament and seven bilateral agreements. As expected, no breakthrough was achieved on a treaty for reducing offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent. As for the talks, both sides tried hard to maintain a harmonious and good atmosphere. The joint communique issued after the meeting stressed the importance of continuing the dialogue, holding that "dialogue can become a constructive basis for resolving the problems of today and tomorrow." All this indicates that although there are still differences between the two sides, both aspire to maintain the momentum of detente. Judging by reactions in various parts of the world, although evaluations of the meeting differ, there is universal welcome for the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States are continuing to maintain the trend of dialogue.

As for the results of the meeting, it cannot be said that no progress was made, but no agreement was reached on the most important issue on the agenda, that of reducing offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent. After the INF treaty was signed during the Washington meeting, the Soviet Union and the United States intended to sign at the Moscow meeting a treaty reducing strategic weapons by 50 percent, to demonstrate to the world the new

development of U.S.-Soviet relations. However, there were several setbacks, and before the meeting opened, both sides had no choice but to announce that they had abandoned hope on this issue. It appears that it is by no means easy for the Soviet Union and the United States to seek compromise on certain key issues. Although this summit meeting discussed the question again, and continued to emit an atmosphere of optimism, most of the impression gained from the Moscow meeting was, as some public opinion has pointed out, that of an atmosphere of harmony and warmth but with a lack of any substance.

It cannot be ignored that no small change in U.S.-Soviet relations has been shown by the fact that the U.S. president, who previously termed the Soviet Union an "evil empire," has personally gone to Moscow now to attend a summit meeting there. There are naturally many factors involved here, but the two countries mainly based their moves on current policy requirements. What is particularly important is that the two superpowers are now switching the focus of their rivalry from strategic weapons to competition in overall national strength and are concentrating forces for the development of high-technology and space weapons. At the same time they are formulating new rules for the race. This requires easing the tension in U.S.-Soviet relations, and this momentum of detente may last for quite a long time. Of course, such a change in U.S.-Soviet relations by no means alters the pattern of both dialogue and confrontation between them. The two sides will not yield to each other and will continue to be beset with contradictions on substantive issues involving their national interests.

It must be realized that the strengthening of the trend of dialogue between the two superpowers is always better than a deterioration in their confrontation. This is why public opinion around the world has welcomed the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow. However, it must be pointed out at the same time that the results of the

Moscow summit did not match people's hopes. World opinion has pointed out that the INF treaty only involves 3 to 4 percent of the two superpowers' nuclear weapons arsenal, and is only the first step in nuclear disarmament. Yet half a year after its signing, they have not taken any proper steps, but on the contrary are still exerting efforts to maintain nuclear superiority. The facts prove that this way of doing things can only lead to a continuation of the nuclear arms race and an increase in the danger of nuclear war. The number of strategic weapons has not been reduced by much, and the number of high-quality precision weapons continues to increase. This cannot but arouse apprehension among the countries and peoples of the world.

While the Moscow summit was in progress, the international community was also convening two meetings: the special ministerial-level disarmament conference of non-aligned states, and the 3d UNGA [United National General Assembly] special disarmament conference. These two broadly representative meetings have unanimously appealed to the people of all countries to promote the world disarmament movement, and strongly demanded that the United States and the Soviet Union reduce their armaments, take the lead in greatly reducing their nuclear and conventional weaponry, and ban an arms race in space. These resounding calls fully reflect the desires of peoples around the world. The two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, ought to seriously listen to these just calls and carry out their unshirkable responsibilities for world peace and the future of mankind.

General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan have stated many times that they want to make constructive efforts for world peace and international disarmament. People's hopes are now placed in them. In addition to considering the interests of the Soviet Union and the United States, they should also consider the interests of the countries and peoples of the world; and they should not just limit themselves to words, but produce practical action.

INTRABLOC

International Parliamentary Meeting Held in Sofia

USSR Delegation Arrives

AU2905190988 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian
1730 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] A Soviet parliamentary delegation, headed by Avgust Voss, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, arrived in Sofia today.

The delegation will participate in a meeting of parliamentarians from European countries that is scheduled to open in Sofia on 31 May. The meeting will be devoted to the transformation of the Balkans and other European areas into zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons.

The delegation was welcomed at Sofia airport by Stanko Todorov, chairman of the National Assembly, and Petur Vutov, chairman of the Bulgarian Interparliamentary Group. Viktor Sharapov, USSR ambassador to Bulgaria, was also among those present at the airport.

Todorov Receives Group

AU3005143288 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian
0900 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] On 30 May Stanko Todorov, National Assembly chairman, received the USSR parliamentary delegation led by Avgust Voss, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The delegation will take part in the meeting of parliamentarians from European countries devoted to turning the Balkans and other European regions into zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons that is scheduled to open in Sofia on 31 May.

During the talk the sides stressed the ascending development of Bulgarian-USSR relations, as well as strengthening and expanding friendship and cooperation, something to which the two countries' parliamentarians have also contributed.

Comrade Stanko Todorov briefed the guests on restructuring in Bulgaria. He dwelled in detail on the principle of self-management on the part of the labor collectives and territorial communities, and on the forthcoming amendments of the legislative system. He also spoke on Bulgaria's successes in implementing the tasks of the current 5-year plan.

The Soviet guests were briefed on the preparations for the 80th Interparliamentary Conference, which will take place in Sofia in September 1988.

Petur Vutov, chairman of the Bulgarian Interparliamentary Group, took part in the meeting.

Vutov Opens Meeting

AU3105090888 Sofia BTA in English
0722 GMT 31 May 88

["Meeting of Parliamentarians"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, May 31 (BTA)—The establishment of nuclear- and chemical-weapon-free zones in the Balkans and in other parts of Europe is discussed at an international parliamentary meeting which opened here today. In the course of two days, the participating M.P.s from a number of countries in Europe and M.E.P.s will be exchanging views and will set forth their ideas on the feasibility of establishing such zones. "Bulgaria sets great store by the establishment of nuclear- and chemical-weapon-free zones throughout Europe and more specifically in the Balkans," said Dr Peter Vutov, president of the Bulgarian Interparliamentary Group, at the opening of the forum. "We regard this problem as a practically feasible task, given the political will, and as a substantial factor of building peace and security at a regional and a global level," he said. Recalling the initiatives advanced and cosponsored by Bulgaria on banning nuclear and chemical weapons from the Balkans, Dr Petur Vutov pointed out that in her efforts towards the realization of these initiatives, Bulgaria studies the experience gained by other countries. "We believe that any dialogue on these matters is useful as international cooperation could produce new, additional interesting ideas and suggestions which will help us progress towards peace and understanding," he said.

He emphasized that the current discussion could contribute to interparliamentary cooperation not only on disarmament problems but also to its promotion in other areas of common interest.

For the first time in mankind's history, the signing of the Soviet-American INF Treaty cleared the way for actual nuclear disarmament. Peace champions are looking forward to the next logical step: the finalizing of the agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arsenals. The Gorbachev-Reagan summit in Moscow could contribute substantially to this end, Dr Petur Vutov emphasized.

He recalled the known preparedness of the USSR to respect the status of the nuclear-free zones.

A greetings address to the participants was read from Dr Hans Stercken, president of the Council of the Interparliamentary Union. He thanks the Bulgarian Interparliamentary Group for initiating the current meeting.

Stressing that every effort channelled into the elimination of a class of the most destructive and terrible weapons ever devised by man should be viewed as exceedingly beneficial, Dr Hans Stercken discusses the opportunity for an agreement on a global chemical weapons ban agreement.

Participants Discuss Issues

AU3105175388 Sofia BTA in English
1608 GMT 31 May 88

["For a World Free of Nuclear and Chemical Weapons"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, May 31 (BTA)—Bulgaria is hosting the first international meeting of parliamentarians on nuclear and chemical-weapon-free zones in Europe.

The debates which started here today expressed the unanimous opinion that the modern realities make it necessary for the world to free itself of mass annihilation weapons, and above all of the nuclear and chemical weapons.

Bearing in mind their responsibility before the people who have elected them, the MP's spoke of the timeliness of the numerous initiatives and proposals for establishing zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons in different parts of Europe. They are convinced that their realization would be a considerable contribution to the process of detente and to the promotion of the relations of goodneighborliness, understanding and cooperation. We can and we should proceed to nuclear disarmament both through global solutions and through regional actions.

It was pointed out that the progress in the development of Soviet-American relations is creating chances and better preconditions for establishing nuclear-free zones.

The statements stressed the importance of the Soviet-American INF Treaty as an actual start on the road to a nuclear-weapon-free world. It was pointed out that the peoples are expecting new positive results in this respect from the current Soviet-American summit.

The participants in the international parliamentary meeting will have sent greetings addresses to Dr Hans Stercken, president of the Interparliamentary Union, to Mr Pierre Cornillon, secretary general of the union and to Mr Giulio Andreotti, minister of foreign affairs of Italy and chairman of the Italian Interparliamentary Group.

Voss on Soviet Support for Peace

AU0306133988 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 1 Jun 88 p 2

[Interview with Avgust Voss, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and leader of the Soviet delegation to the Sofia meeting of parliamentarians from European countries on turning the Balkans and other European regions into nuclear- and chemical-weapon-free zones, by unidentified representative of RABOTNICHESKO DELO, in Sofia: "Unity—the Guarantee for Success"—date not given]

[Text] [RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Avgust Eduardovich, at the present the USSR is the only nuclear country which directly borders on the Balkans that has a positive

attitude to the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in this region and expresses its readiness to observe the region's status as soon as it is determined. What actions is the Soviet Union undertaking in this direction and what results does it expect from them?

[Voss] The USSR is doing everything possible to support the initiative of Bulgaria and the other Balkan countries for creating a nuclear-free zone in this important region. And these are not merely words. We are conducting a policy on a worldwide scale aimed at creating as many nuclear-free zones as possible on our planet Earth. Since we are now discussing the Balkans, I will be more specific: We are ready to act as guarantors in the event of such a zone being set up in this part of Europe. We believe that by joint efforts we will manage to resolve this problem in the interest not only of the Balkan countries, but also of the states of the continent and the entire world. I reiterate once again—this can come about only by joint efforts.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] You mentioned the Soviet Union's readiness to be a guarantor for this vitally important process in the Balkans.... Does this readiness also apply to other regions in the world?

[Voss] Most certainly. Moreover, the USSR is not only a possible guarantor, it is first and foremost an active participant in this process. Let us take northern Europe, for example: We have already made a number of proposals and taken quite specific steps to reduce tension and minimize military activities in this part of the continent. We carried out our first initiatives unilaterally, but with every passing day they are finding increasing support in the northern countries. This also emerges from the speech of the Finnish representative at the Sofia meeting. In essence he expressed once again his country's position of supporting the Soviet initiatives put forward in Murmansk by Mikhail Gorbachev. I say "once again" in order to remind you that recently an important meeting took place in Helsinki on the problems of creating a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, which also touched on aspects relating to the declaration of nuclear- and chemical-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] What in your view are the main obstacles?

[Voss] Clearly, the main obstacle is the unwillingness of certain NATO countries to take part in the search for the most correct answer. You can see it for yourself, it is also proven by this meeting of ours in Sofia. All 35 of the states that signed the Helsinki Final Act were invited to the meeting, and representatives from 14 countries and the European Parliament arrived. In other words, more than a few states did not consider it necessary or possible to send their delegations to this forum, a most important one in my view, at which we are frankly and openly exchanging views concerning the future of mankind.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] One of the speeches on the first day stressed the difficult task that our country took on in hosting and organizing the interparliamentary meeting. Let us try to view things from this angle: Do you think that the events taking place at the moment in the National Assembly building disprove the claims made in the West that the small nonnuclear states cannot influence the policies of countries that possess this weapon?

[Voss] Yes, I do. All countries, both great and small, can and must take an active part in this cause. Bulgaria is a small country, but the strength of its voice is equal to that of any large country when it comes down to expressing the desire to turn nuclear disarmament into an irreversible process and the striving for lasting peace and understanding. It is precisely in this unity of the actions of "small" and "large" countries that we see the guarantees for success in the cause that we have taken up....

Weapons Issues Discussed

AU0106143188 Sofia BTA in English
1336 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] Sofia, June 1 (BTA)—In their discussions yesterday and today, members of the parliaments of 14 countries participants in the CSCE exchanged opinions on issues related to establishing nuclear and chemical weapon free zones in Europe. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the European Parliament.

The 32 MPs who took the floor expressed their own stands or those of their countries and parties on the possibilities for establishing zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons in the Balkans and in northern and central Europe. Some voiced different even contrary points of view, especially as regards the ways and means to achieving this aim. It was pointed out that certain progress has been made in some regions but that this still does not correspond to the wishes of the European peoples. A number of MPs made concrete recommendations for giving a fresh impetus to the CSCE process, including for starting businesslike talks on the problems of establishing zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons.

A growing understanding was shown that the establishment of zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons is an important trend in the efforts for increasing confidence among the states and for freeing mankind of the dangers of a nuclear conflict.

The speakers paid special attention to the fact that the meeting is taking place simultaneously with the Moscow summit. They stressed the hope with which the peoples of the world are expecting the meeting between Mr Mikhail Gorbachev and Mr Ronald Reagan to lead to new concrete steps in the field of disarmament and the diminishing of the threat of war. Progress made on the

road to the signing of a treaty for a 50 per cent reduction of strategic strike weapons is acquiring particular importance with the coming of the INF Treaty into force.

Summing up the results of the meeting, Dr Petur Vutov, president of the Bulgarian Interparliamentary Group, pointed out that it was an expression of a growing interest in establishing nuclear and chemical weapon free zones and of the striving to build a nuclear-free world.

It was observed that the meeting took place at a turning point in the history of human civilization when real possibilities and prospects are being revealed for forming a new, more perfect, democratic and humane type of international relations free of the past prejudices and hostilities.

At the press conference the participants in the meeting stressed the necessity for the dialogue on these issues to continue and for promoting the positive trends which are finding their way in the international field.

Romania's Ivascu Speaks

AU0206154688 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1429 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] Sofia, AGERPRES, 02/06/1988—The meeting of parliamentarians from the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, devoted to turning the Balkans and other regions of Europe into nuclear and chemical-weapon free zones ended in Sofia.

The Romanian delegation was headed by Marin Ivascu, deputy chairman of the Grand National Assembly, chairman of the Romanian Group in the Interparliamentary Union.

Setting forth Romania's and President Nicolae Ceausescu's position on the just and democratic settlement of the cardinal issues facing the international community, the Romanian representative laid stress on the Romanian president's considerations on the current imperatives of instating a climate of understanding, collaboration and peace in Europe, of implementing real disarmament measures, nuclear above all, in the continent and the world over. In context, emphasis was placed on Romania's active contribution to the elaboration and promotion of the concept regarding the transformation of the Balkans into a zone of peace and collaboration, free of nuclear and chemical arms, of foreign military bases and troops, as part and parcel of the process of building security and cooperation in Europe.

Evincing the need and topicality of holding a Balkan summit in Bucharest, the Romanian representative stated for the amplification of parliamentary efforts too to make new steps along the line of strengthening peace, good neighbourhood and trust among states in the

region. Romania's support was reiterated for the creation of nuclear- and chemical-weapon free zones in other regions of Europe too.

Pact Leaders at Third UN Disarmament Session

Fischer Opens Meeting

LD0106093488 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1930 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] United Nations, New York, 31 May (ADN)—The UN General Assembly met today in New York for its third special session on disarmament. GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer opened the meeting in the great domed chamber of the UN building, and announced to the delegates of the 159 member states that the meeting is being followed attentively worldwide. "The great interest of the UN member states, which have sent high-ranking government representatives, and the numerous nonstate organizations represented here, underline this. The peoples attach to this forum the hope that disarmament negotiations in the spirit of security through disarmament, agreed upon at the first special session for disarmament, will receive a strong impetus. The most recent positive developments in international relations justify growing optimism."

The GDR foreign minister added that the treaty agreed upon last year between the USSR and the United States concerning the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is the first effective and far-reaching step in nuclear disarmament. Progress is expected from the meeting between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan taking place at the moment in Moscow. "The coincidence of both events—the summit meeting and this special session—has a deep symbolism. It shows that the dialogue on the decisive question for the survival of mankind—disarmament—is being intensified at all levels, bilateral and multilateral, in the interest of the peoples".

Afterwards, the UN delegates elected GDR deputy foreign minister Peter Florin, president of the 42d UN General Assembly, as president of the special disarmament session.

Peter Florin then spoke and thanked the delegates for the trust in him expressed by his election to the high office. The international situation, he said in his speech, has started moving forward. The elimination of 4-5 percent of all nuclear weapons, as provided for in the treaty on the abolition of intermediate-range missiles, should and can be the start of the road to a nuclear weapons-free world. The conflicts which continue to exist in the world and in which weapons are doing the talking do not appear as insoluble as formerly. The accords on the settlement of the Afghanistan conflict are as much a proof of this as the continuing efforts to resolve the conflict in Central America.

But the nuclear arms race has still not been halted, Florin said. Nuclear weapons tests are continuing. The striving to pile up conventional weapons is continuing in many regions of the world. The arms race is placing an unbearable economic burden on the world. It is obvious that no country and no group of countries can solve the accumulating economic, social, and ecological problems and at the same time finance an increasingly expensive arms race.

Florin said that the latest summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan will give fresh impetus to further negotiations. "As realistic politicians, we know the significance of an understanding between the USSR and the United States for international developments, and that is why we welcome every constructive joint statement and action."

Touching upon the initiatives to promote the disarmament process, Peter Florin also pointed to the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to be held in Berlin at the end of June. He stressed that a halt to the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament has the highest priority. It is certainly no easy task to bring together all ideas and concepts of the states and groups of states. The UN special session will face up to this task, however. The dialogue on a comprehensive system of world peace and international security will be continued. He was confident that the session will become a forum for constructive and successful efforts of the world community to contain the arms race, to search for links in the positions of all groups of states, and to make bold and generally acceptable decisions.

Bulgarian Interviewed

AU0106094988 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 30 May 88 p 7

[Interview with Lyuben Gotsev, deputy minister of foreign affairs, by "representative of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO editorial board," entitled "Disarmament—An Irreversible Process"—date and place not given]

[Text] A representative of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO editorial board interviewed Lyuben Gotsev, deputy minister of foreign affairs, in connection with the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, and its importance for the general activity of the world organization.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Why are the UN member states convening a special session on issues of disarmament? What is the purpose of such forums and more specifically of the forthcoming third special session?

[Gotsev] Discussion about the general principles of cooperation among the UN member states in everything related to protecting world peace and security, including the area of disarmament, is one of the functions of the UN General Assembly. In 1978, in connection with the

increased threat of a nuclear catastrophe, the UN General Assembly held the first special session devoted to disarmament. That was a session of everlasting importance, because it defined for the first time the goals, priority tasks, and principles of international cooperation in the area of disarmament. A program of action was also coordinated at the session.

The tough military-political course followed by certain circles in the West during the first half of the eighties delayed the implementation of that program, and to a certain degree obliterated the decisions of the first UN special session on disarmament.

As a result mainly of new political thinking, recently good sense, realism, and mutual readiness to compromise for the sake of eliminating the nuclear threat and intensifying the process of disarmament are gaining the upper hand. The historic USSR-U.S. INF Treaty has been signed. Prospects for achieving progress in the talks on reducing the USSR and U.S. strategic offensive nuclear weapons by 50 percent, banning the arms race in space, and gradually limiting and stopping nuclear weapons tests, are evident. The contours of an international convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons are emerging. We are on the eve of talks on reducing armed forces and arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. All this confirms the realism of the declaration of Mikhail Gorbachev of 15 January 1986, which presented a program for freeing the world from weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000.

The third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament will analyze the results and trends in the area of disarmament in the period since the 1982 second special session and will determine the conditions, ways, and means of further reducing and eliminating arms and adopting collateral confidence-building and verification measures.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] How and in what directions will the present international situation influence the forthcoming forum?

[Gotsev] The influence of the international situation on such forums is obvious. The interesting question in this case is whether the third UN General Assembly special session will succeed in utilizing the numerous positive elements that have recently prevailed in East-West relations, and specifically, in USSR-U.S. relations. Despite the fact that the world situation continues to be encumbered by serious and contradictory tendencies, it is increasingly being influenced by such major achievements of the new political thinking and actions as the INF Treaty, and the Geneva talks on settling the situation concerning Afghanistan.

I am convinced that the results of the Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan will directly influence the work of the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament. One can

expect these results to give a new impetus not only to USSR-U.S. relations, but also to the process of disarmament, and to comprehensively strengthening world peace and security.

Under the present conditions we need such an approach to the problems of international security, which would guarantee a balance of the interests of all groups of states. Already the concluding document of the first special session on disarmament incorporated the concept of security through disarmament. The initiative of the socialist countries to set up a comprehensive system of international peace and security, raised at the United Nations, is a new confirmation of this concept. It proceeds even further, and aims at finding solutions for all global issues of the nuclear-space age, without exception.

The third special session will help to strengthen the positive processes, if it is guided by the striving to come closer in everything related to the conceptual approaches of the various groups of countries, to the problems of disarmament.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Can you describe the basic problems which the present session has to cope with, and the stand that will be adopted by the Warsaw Pact member countries?

[Gotsev] The transformation of disarmament into an irreversible process, into an ever intensifying process, undoubtedly is the main question on which the efforts of the states participating in the session should be focused.

The stand of the socialist countries in this respect is well known—following the first breakthrough in nuclear disarmament we are trying to avoid any situation in which, with disarmament developing in one direction, the arms race would expand in another sphere. The further development or production of "exotic" new nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapons would disrupt the process of increasing confidence in East-West relations and would make the disarmament efforts adopted on a bilateral and multilateral basis meaningless.

It is necessary to achieve as soon as possible such radical measures as a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons by both the United States and the USSR, and an agreement on strictly observing the 1972 ABM Treaty and not relinquishing this treaty within an agreed-upon period. The Soviet proposal to set up an international inspectorate responsible for establishing on the spot whether objects launched and stationed in outer space are weapons or not, or whether they are equipped with some kind of weapon, has also helped to prevent an arms race in outer space.

The third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament should have a decisive influence and stimulate the development of a convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons by the end of 1988.

The problem of naval disarmament urgently calls for a solution as well. Although the states of all continents are interested in this solution, the stand of NATO on starting negotiations with the participation of the great naval powers, and especially with those that possess nuclear weapons, is extremely negative. The socialist states will continue to search for mutually acceptable, practical solutions to this problem.

We will also search in a constructive spirit for solutions to basic problems, such as making the mutual relations between disarmament and the development and intensification of the organs dealing with disarmament—the Geneva disarmament conference in particular—more effective.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Can you comment on the participation of the Bulgarian delegation in the forthcoming session?

[Gotsev] Under the leadership of Petur Mladenov, minister of foreign affairs, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is ready to participate actively in the work of the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament. This will be in accordance with our country's increased prestige on questions of consolidating international security and disarmament in the Balkans, in Europe, and the world. The contribution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and Comrade Todor Zhivkov's personal contribution to the transformation of the Balkans into a zone free of mass destruction weapons, and to the intensification of confidence and security measures in the area, enjoys extensive international recognition and is becoming increasingly topical under the present circumstances.

At the forthcoming session, the Bulgarian delegation will strive to make a substantial contribution to the adoption of a uniform approach by the session to conceptual problems—such as formulating new principles of disarmament, if necessary, for example—and to further accelerating the solution of specific questions, such as nuclear and chemical disarmament. The discussion and adoption of a comprehensive disarmament program, the text of which has been the subject of negotiations for several years already, is also a goal of the delegation.

Finally, I would like to point out that the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, like the two previous sessions on the same subject, will be a forum of the social forces from all over the world struggling for the victory of the idea of creating a world free of weapons and violence. More than ever before, governments and politicians are listening to the voice of the public whose representatives have confirmed their responsible attitude to the problems of peace and disarmament on several occasions. We expect the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament to develop new ideas in the disarmament sector, and we

expect the people's diplomacy to make a specific contribution to this exceptionally complicated sphere in international relations aimed at greater security and peace.

BULGARIA

Foreign Affairs Official Interviewed on Session
AU0106094988 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 30 May 88 p 7

[Interview with Lyuben Gotsev, deputy minister of foreign affairs, by "representative of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO editorial board," entitled "Disarmament—An Irreversible Process"—date and place not given]

[Text] A representative of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO editorial board interviewed Lyuben Gotsev, deputy minister of foreign affairs, in connection with the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, and its importance for the general activity of the world organization.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Why are the UN member states convening a special session on issues of disarmament? What is the purpose of such forums and more specifically of the forthcoming third special session?

[Gotsev] Discussion about the general principles of cooperation among the UN member states in everything related to protecting world peace and security, including the area of disarmament, is one of the functions of the UN General Assembly. In 1978, in connection with the increased threat of a nuclear catastrophe, the UN General Assembly held the first special session devoted to disarmament. That was a session of everlasting importance, because it defined for the first time the goals, priority tasks, and principles of international cooperation in the area of disarmament. A program of action was also coordinated at the session.

The tough military-political course followed by certain circles in the West during the first half of the eighties delayed the implementation of that program, and to a certain degree obliterated the decisions of the first UN special session on disarmament.

As a result mainly of new political thinking, recently good sense, realism, and mutual readiness to compromise for the sake of eliminating the nuclear threat and intensifying the process of disarmament are gaining the upper hand. The historic USSR-U.S. INF Treaty has been signed. Prospects for achieving progress in the talks on reducing the USSR and U.S. strategic offensive nuclear weapons by 50 percent, banning the arms race in space, and gradually limiting and stopping nuclear weapons tests, are evident. The contours of an international convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons are emerging. We are on the eve of talks on reducing armed forces and arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. All this confirms the realism of the declaration

of Mikhail Gorbachev of 15 January 1986, which presented a program for freeing the world from weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000.

The third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament will analyze the results and trends in the area of disarmament in the period since the 1982 second special session and will determine the conditions, ways, and means of further reducing and eliminating arms and adopting collateral confidence-building and verification measures.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] How and in what directions will the present international situation influence the forthcoming forum?

[Gotsev] The influence of the international situation on such forums is obvious. The interesting question in this case is whether the third UN General Assembly special session will succeed in utilizing the numerous positive elements that have recently prevailed in East-West relations, and specifically, in USSR-U.S. relations. Despite the fact that the world situation continues to be encumbered by serious and contradictory tendencies, it is increasingly being influenced by such major achievements of the new political thinking and actions as the INF Treaty, and the Geneva talks on settling the situation concerning Afghanistan.

I am convinced that the results of the Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan will directly influence the work of the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament. One can expect these results to give a new impetus not only to USSR-U.S. relations, but also to the process of disarmament, and to comprehensively strengthening world peace and security.

Under the present conditions we need such an approach to the problems of international security, which would guarantee a balance of the interests of all groups of states. Already the concluding document of the first special session on disarmament incorporated the concept of security through disarmament. The initiative of the socialist countries to set up a comprehensive system of international peace and security, raised at the United Nations, is a new confirmation of this concept. It proceeds even further, and aims at finding solutions for all global issues of the nuclear-space age, without exception.

The third special session will help to strengthen the positive processes, if it is guided by the striving to come closer in everything related to the conceptual approaches of the various groups of countries, to the problems of disarmament.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Can you describe the basic problems which the present session has to cope with, and the stand that will be adopted by the Warsaw Pact member countries?

[Gotsev] The transformation of disarmament into an irreversible process, into an ever intensifying process, undoubtedly is the main question on which the efforts of the states participating in the session should be focused.

The stand of the socialist countries in this respect is well known—following the first breakthrough in nuclear disarmament we are trying to avoid any situation in which, with disarmament developing in one direction, the arms race would expand in another sphere. The further development or production of "exotic" new nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapons would disrupt the process of increasing confidence in East-West relations and would make the disarmament efforts adopted on a bilateral and multilateral basis meaningless.

It is necessary to achieve as soon as possible such radical measures as a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons by both the United States and the USSR, and an agreement on strictly observing the 1972 ABM Treaty and not relinquishing this treaty within an agreed-upon period. The Soviet proposal to set up an international inspectorate responsible for establishing on the spot whether objects launched and stationed in outer space are weapons or not, or whether they are equipped with some kind of weapon, has also helped to prevent an arms race in outer space.

The third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament should have a decisive influence and stimulate the development of a convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons by the end of 1988.

The problem of naval disarmament urgently calls for a solution as well. Although the states of all continents are interested in this solution, the stand of NATO on starting negotiations with the participation of the great naval powers, and especially with those that possess nuclear weapons, is extremely negative. The socialist states will continue to search for mutually acceptable, practical solutions to this problem.

We will also search in a constructive spirit for solutions to basic problems, such as making the mutual relations between disarmament and the development and intensification of the organs dealing with disarmament—the Geneva disarmament conference in particular—more effective.

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO] Can you comment on the participation of the Bulgarian delegation in the forthcoming session?

[Gotsev] Under the leadership of Petur Mladenov, minister of foreign affairs, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is ready to participate actively in the work of the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament. This will be in accordance with our country's increased prestige on questions of consolidating international security and disarmament in the Balkans, in Europe, and the world. The contribution of

the People's Republic of Bulgaria and Comrade Todor Zhivkov's personal contribution to the transformation of the Balkans into a zone free of mass destruction weapons, and to the intensification of confidence and security measures in the area, enjoys extensive international recognition and is becoming increasingly topical under the present circumstances.

At the forthcoming session, the Bulgarian delegation will strive to make a substantial contribution to the adoption of a uniform approach by the session to conceptual problems—such as formulating new principles of disarmament, if necessary, for example—and to further accelerating the solution of specific questions, such as nuclear and chemical disarmament. The discussion and adoption of a comprehensive disarmament program, the text of which has been the subject of negotiations for several years already, is also a goal of the delegation.

Finally, I would like to point out that the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, like the two previous sessions on the same subject, will be a forum of the social forces from all over the world struggling for the victory of the idea of creating a world free of weapons and violence. More than ever before, governments and politicians are listening to the voice of the public whose representatives have confirmed their responsible attitude to the problems of peace and disarmament on several occasions. We expect the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament to develop new ideas in the disarmament sector, and we expect the people's diplomacy to make a specific contribution to this exceptionally complicated sphere in international relations aimed at greater security and peace.

Moscow Summit Positively Assessed
AU0206170288 Sofia BTA in English
1622 GMT 1 Jun 88

["Under the Sign of Big Politics"—BTA headline]

[Text] Moscow, June 2 (BTA political observer Nencho Khranov)—In the past five days Moscow really was a venue of big politics. Not only because the protagonists were the leaders of the two most powerful countries in the world. And not because the fourth Soviet-American summit was covered by a record number of journalists—more than five thousand. What makes the attribute "big" appropriate is, as Mr Mikhail Gorbachev said in his speech at the exchange of the instruments ratifying the INF Treaty, that this politics concerns the interests of millions and millions of people and that the preservation of peace depends on it.

Politicians and observers are yet to analyze the documents of the Moscow summit and to assess its results. But it seems to me that even now we may assert with confidence that it was a strong expression of political realism and of a sincere striving to cut the Gordian knots

of the nuclear age and to raise the foundations of a nuclear-weapon-free, secure and humane world. It was a strong expression of the new political thinking and action of the Soviet Union.

Naturally perfectionists, who adhere to the principle "everything or nothing" may say that this summit has yielded no impressive and spectacular results, that the leaders did not sign the START Treaty. But in our times the more fruitful policy is that of surmounting difficulties carefully and consistently, of overcoming stereotypes and of seeking not what divides the East and the West but what unites mankind as a whole—the averting of the nuclear threat and the doing away with the relapses of the Cold War.

Viewed from this angle the Moscow summit was successful and fruitful. It not only continued the political dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States and secured the continuity of the Geneva-Reykjavik-Washington line but also patiently and consistently prepared future agreements in the field of disarmament—the START Treaty, the agreements banning chemical weapons and nuclear weapon tests, etc. I would like U.S. Defense Minister Frank Carlucci to be right in saying in his interview yesterday, that in this respect the Moscow summit achieved more than the Washington one. But let us not juxtapose the results of the two summits. Because there is something which unites them—the INF Treaty. It was signed in the U.S. capital, and in less than six months the two leaders exchanged the instruments of its ratification in Moscow. The coming into force of this historic document opened a new era—of the actual annihilation of an entire class of nuclear weapons.

I had the opportunity to be in the St Georgiy Hall and the Yekaterina Hall, and to observe the leaders, their mood, their personal relations. The initial stiffness, which could be seen during their first meeting in Geneva has disappeared, and let this be forever. At present Mr Mikhail Gorbachev and Mr Ronald Reagan are feeling like real partners, who have been entrusted by history with the difficult task of passing the way from normalization to development of the Soviet-American relations. And this task needs scope, sense of responsibility and parting with prejudices. The most frequent question the American journalists asked their President was if he still considered the Soviet Union "the evil empire" he once dubbed it. It seems that his fellow countrymen are more rancorous than the hosts. But every time President Reagan's answer was "No, I don't". Obviously nothing stands still.

I am far from forgetting that the main is yet to come. The Moscow visit displayed certain elements of the propaganda show—tribute was paid to anticommunism. The well-known contradictions between the declarations and the practice of the U.S. policy also appeared at times. But only children believe in miracles. A lot of work must be done before realism prevails in all directions.

That is why certain possibilities were missed in Moscow—in the political formulations, in the complex labyrinth of problems related to the control on missiles, in respect to the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe, on questions of the economic relations between the USSR and the U.S. But that cannot put in the shade everything that has been done.

The Moscow summit is a history already. But it is yet to be felt in the world politics. And finally I would like to recall some of Mr Mikhail Gorbachev's farewell words to Mr Ronald Reagan: "Now with the vast experience of Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington and Moscow and backed up by their achievements, we are simply duty-bound to display still greater determination and consistency. That is what the Soviet and American peoples, international public opinion and the entire world community are expecting of us."

We are convinced that Moscow will make this [sentence as received]. We will expect it from Washington as well.

Mladenov Meets Balkan, Turkish Officials

*AU0506185588 Sofia BTA in English
1822 GMT 5 Jun 88*

[Text] New York, June 5 (BTA correspondent)—Mr Petur Mladenov, Bulgaria's minister of foreign affairs, who attends the Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, met with Mr Budimir Loncar, federal secretary for foreign affairs of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia. They discussed the international situation, the agenda of the UN Session on Disarmament, the situation in the Balkans and bilateral relations.

Mr Petur Mladenov and Mr Budimir Loncar commended highly the Belgrade Meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Balkan Countries and the continued efforts to promote inter-Balkan cooperation. They stressed the significance of the forthcoming meeting of deputy ministers of foreign affairs of the Balkan states in Sofia and expressed their governments' readiness to do everything possible so that the meeting should produce substantive results.

The relations between the two friendly socialist countries were found to be developing fruitfully and promisingly. The sides considered a wide range of questions concerning the prospects of Bulgaro-Yugoslav ties, and they paid particular attention to further political contacts between the two countries.

The meeting was held in a businesslike friendly atmosphere.

Mr Petur Mladenov conferred with his Greek counterpart, Mr Karolos Papoulias. They briefed each other on their countries' internal situation and foreign political activity. The sides reiterated their appraisal of the Belgrade meeting and of the positive processes underway on

the Balkan peninsula. The two ministers emphasized that in the Balkans, there is no alternative to the policy of goodneighborliness based on equality and non-interference in one another's internal affairs.

In this connection, an emphasis was laid on the role of Bulgaro-Greek relations as a model of relations between countries belonging to different social systems. The ministers considered the possibility for joint moves in connection with the forthcoming meeting of Balkan countries' deputy foreign ministers in Sofia this June. Mr Petur Mladenov and Mr Karolos Papoulias discussed some of the items on the agenda of the UN disarmament session.

In connection with the turn of Greece to assume the EC Presidency and with the turn of Bulgaria to assume the CMEA Presidency, the two ministers emphasized that the establishment of equitable and mutually advantageous relations between the two major economic communities is a foremost priority.

The meeting was held in a spirit of complete mutual understanding, characteristic of the relations between Bulgaria and Greece.

In New York, Mr Petur Mladenov, minister of foreign affairs of Bulgaria, had a meeting with Mr Turgut Ozal, prime minister of Turkey. They assessed in positive terms the protocol signed in Belgrade by the two countries' foreign ministers and the talks held subsequently at different levels. Bulgaria and Turkey expressed their readiness to promote their relations in various fields. It was emphasized that this goal can only be achieved through a continued bilateral dialogues in the spirit of cooperation and goodneighborliness. The sides considered the possibility for upgrading bilateral contacts to a higher level.

The meeting was held in a constructive atmosphere.

Mr Petur Mladenov's talks with Balkan states' representatives at the third special session of the UN General Assembly devoted to disarmament were held in keeping with Bulgaria's consistently constructive Balkan policy and came as further evidence of the upgrade development of her relations with the neighboring states.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

UN Disarmament Session Delegation Appointed

*AU3105124188 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech
27 May 88 p 1*

[CTK report: "Czechoslovak Delegation Appointed"]

[Text] Prague—The CSSR Government has appointed the Czechoslovak delegation to the third extraordinary UN General Assembly session on disarmament, which will start in New York on 31 May 1988.

The delegation will be headed by Bohuslav Chnoupek, CSSR minister of foreign affairs. Its other members are Evzen Zapotocky, permanent CSSR representative to the UN, Milos Vejvoda, permanent CSSR representative to the UN Geneva office, and Jiri Pavlovsky and Vaclav Mikulka, staff members of the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the CSSR's permanent mission to the UN.

Chnoupek Leaves for Session

*LD2905145188 Prague CTK in English
1323 GMT 29 May 88*

[Text] Prague May 29 (CTK)—Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek left here today for New York to head Czechoslovakia's delegation to the 3rd special session of the U.S. General Assembly on disarmament.

CTK Reports Moscow Summit Opening

*LD2905155788 Prague CTK in English
1459 GMT 29 May 88*

[By Karel Filek]

[Text] Moscow May 29 (CTK)—The Soviet-U.S. summit opening today has been for a long time the theme of considerations about the development of relations between the two superpowers to date and their future, with Soviet and foreign political observers pointing out the shift in these relations from confrontation to cooperation which has a positive influence on the overall development of the political situation.

U.S. President Ronald Reagan, who only several years ago spoke about the Soviet Union as an "empire of evil", has now arrived for his already fourth meeting with top Soviet representative Mikhail Gorbachev. Already their previous meetings have shown that in spite of principle differences in views, the two statesmen are able to work together and jointly achieve positive results.

The treaty on the liquidation of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is unequivocally considered the greatest success of their talks to date, although the protractedness around its ratification in the U.S. Senate again proved that there still exist forces in the United States opposing not only disarmament but also any understanding with the Soviet Union.

However, a majority of Americans have recognized the nonsensicalness of further arms race which would not only increase the danger of a nuclear catastrophe but also drain away immense resources needed in the economy as shown by the fact that in the 1947-87 period, the United States' military spendings exceeded the value of all civilian industrial facilities, including equipment, and all infrastructure of the United States.

A change of arms production into production for peaceful purposes would not only benefit the two superpowers but would also open up the possibilities of cooperation in the solution of a whole range of global problems no matter if it be in the sphere of medicine, biology, ecology or of joint space flights.

It was very likely the influence of the public opinion which played the decisive role in the changes observed in the policy of the Reagan administration. As has been shown by the latest public opinion polls, almost three quarters of Americans support the treaty on the liquidation of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and the same number of them call for 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons.

It must be noted, however, that a significant shift has also occurred in the foreign-political practice of the Soviet Union. The policy of restructuring carried out by the new Soviet leadership has the determining influence on the formulation of the country's new foreign political line. There exists an organic link between the restructuring in the Soviet Union and the restructuring of international relations.

U.S. Human Rights Discussion Criticized

*LD3105103388 Prague CTK in English
0656 GMT 31 May 88*

[Text] Prague May 31 (CTK)—RUDE PRAVO today analyzed the different Soviet and U.S. concepts of security and made it clear that the discussion of human rights issues can no longer be used by the Americans to trouble the waters before the primary issue, disarmament, is debated at summits.

Politicians in Washington do not understand the Soviet concept of security, the Soviet notion of what international relations should be like.

The Soviet Union bases its concept on "sufficient defence capability, i.e. having the lowest possible level of armed forces which is necessary for defence". This means substantial cuts in troops and armaments. Those who want to attack must have a superior strength. "This is why the attempts to gain military superiority are fertile soil for the policy of confrontation."

Indeed, the Soviet notions do not fit in with the American ways of political thinking. For centuries, the Americans based the security and interests of states on the pyramid of strength. The gist of the matter is that this way of thinking and the practical policies resulting from it have always ended in a confrontation as the shaky balance caved in at a certain moment.

"Certainly, the Soviet views are new, and even epoch-making, and this is why they also require time for tests and experiments. Nevertheless, it is necessary to understand them and identify oneself with them." None of the Soviet aims in foreign policy can be fulfilled without the

contribution of the partners. No one will disarm unilaterally, everything is possible in mutual coordination, "the arms of the balance must not be thrown off position for a second".

RUDE PRAVO referred to President Reagan's oft repeated statement that there is armament because the partners do not trust each other. "However, seeking confidence and arming at the same time does not make sense. Disarming, and thus beginning to trust each other—this is the logical and reasonable road leading forward", the paper wrote.

It noted that at the current Moscow summit the President is reported to have presented the human rights issue in a "strongly" worded statement. He spoke much about it, and in a confrontational spirit. "The Americans actually do this at every summit. They bang on the table and trouble the waters before the main and primary issue, talks on disarmament, begin". This time the Soviet hosts did not let themselves be thrown off balance. Mikhail Gorbachev replied that the Soviet Union was just as interested in human rights as the USA and wanted the issue to be discussed at a forum considered suitable by the USA.

"The Americans' gunpowder has got wet. Somehow they failed to notice that substantial changes have taken place in the Soviet Union, that the development of democracy is one of the basic tools and manifestations of the Soviet policy of restructuring. The problem is turning the other way round. Today...it is up to the Soviet Union to ask questions about human rights observance in the United States. The American guests do not feel at all comfortable in this situation which is new also for them", RUDE PRAVO wrote.

RUDE PRAVO on U.S. 'Intransigence at Summit'

AU0306111888 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech
1 Jun 88 p 3

[Commentary by Milan Jelinek, RUDE PRAVO's special correspondent in Moscow: "Verification—Key to Disarmament"]

[Text] Let us visualize the following situation. Two people are sitting opposite each other in a room and talking about a certain building. One of them claims that it is white, the other says no, it is black. None of them will budge because each of them is convinced, though possibly mistakenly so, that truth is on his side. The contradictory statements are repeated so long that the feeling arises that the talk is pointless, that it would be better to wind it up, and perhaps even to slam the door behind oneself. How can one head off such an unfortunate ending? The two agree that they will go and have a look at the building together. They can touch it, take samples of the dye, and, why not, even have it guarded at night to make sure that the other does not repaint it.

Indeed, this is what is happening at the Soviet-American talks in Moscow, and not for the first time. The reverse used to be far more frequent in the past, including, unfortunately, that ominous ending, the slamming of doors. Today, neither side intends to slam the door any more. On the contrary, today there prevails an evident and demonstrable effort to negotiate and continue the dialogue. However, on a number of contentious issues the American partner prefers the exchange of words—yes and no—instead of going to see what reality looks like.

Let us consider the question of curbing conventional armament and the number of troops in Europe, which ranks second on the working agenda of the Moscow talks, immediately after the problem of nuclear disarmament. The connections are clear—the continuation of nuclear disarmament also requires corresponding measures in the sphere of conventional weapons. Moreover, the Warsaw Pact and NATO represent the two most powerful military alliances that confront each other and the concentration of weapons in Europe is without parallel in the world. This is, therefore, really a matter of world security.

The Soviet Union, noting that there is a military balance in Europe, proposes a reduction of weapons and troops—the term used is reduction of the "level of military confrontation"—to the lowest possible level. The Americans maintain that they will not reduce anything, that it would be unjust because the Warsaw Pact has a preponderance. The American position means, in the final analysis, that NATO must first build up its armament, and only then will it consider a reduction in the armies' armaments. The Warsaw Pact states, however, are convinced that there is parity. Should NATO upset it, they will have to adopt suitable countermeasures. The result? An inescapable arms carousel. That is why there is a categorical imperative to find a way out.

The USSR proposes that the two alliances exchange data on the numbers, structure, equipment, and stationing of armed forces, data that are verified and verifiable. It concedes an asymmetry, an imbalance, in certain types of weapons. For instance: We have more tanks, you have more aircraft, let the side that has more in a given category reduce its numbers to the lower level of the other side. All this is possible and workable under one prerequisite; the two sides can reach agreement if and when they know the actual state of affairs, something that can only be achieved by a system of verification and inspection.

Comprehensive verification using all available and useful means, including naturally inspections on the spot, is for the Soviet Union the key that opens all the locks impeding the development of the process of disarmament. This standpoint is new and of principled importance. It is true that, in the past, the USSR upheld the view that national technical means are sufficient to monitor compliance with agreements on disarmament.

It is now apparent that they were not sufficient and the Soviet Union has changed its position. The Americans used to hide behind the argument that the Soviets do not want any verification and that, therefore, there will be no disarmament. But the new Soviet policy has turned the problem completely around. [It stresses] Disarm and verify, verify and disarm, everyone must be sure at any moment that he is not cheated and that his security is not jeopardized.

In its responses to the Soviet proposal for an exchange of data between NATO and the Warsaw Pact so far, the U.S. Administration has maintained that it must consult its allies. But it does not hear this proposal for the first time; in Moscow it has been advanced anew, in an even more detailed form. So far, the Soviet hosts have not received a reply. The question has come to a head and the world public can now judge: Do the United States and its NATO allies, want, or do they not want, to put an end to the war of words about who has or does not have military superiority in Europe, and who poses a threat to whom?

Disputes over verification are also rampant in the question of nuclear disarmament, in the debates concerning the proposed treaty on a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons. It seems that stationary missiles deployed in ground silos will not be an obstacle to an agreement; it would indeed be hard to come up with some hitch, as the missiles can be counted and subjected to inspection. The knot that the American side is trying to entangle as much as it conceivably can concerns missiles on mobile carriers, be they land-based, air-based, or sea-based.

The American delegation is particularly intransigent with regard to sea-launched cruise missiles. The Americans have found an 'argument'—reliable verification supposedly does not exist and is not technically workable, the best solution would therefore be to strike some types of weapons out of the agreement. However, in this way they are opening a "side door" for the continuation of the nuclear arms race, not to mention the possibility of upsetting the military-strategic balance. The Soviets propose: We have the technology to detect and verify nuclear weapons on ships and submarines and you, Americans, do not believe us. Okay, let us take two submarines and we shall accurately determine which one of them has nuclear weapons on board. Let us make an experiment, let us go and see!

Let us not overtake developments. The marathon of the dialogue on disarmament treaty number two has far from ended.

CSSR Foreign Minister Speaks at UN Session
LD0706205388 Prague CTK in English
1626 GMT 7 Jun 88

[Text] New York, June 7 (CTK correspondent)—Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek said here today that Czechoslovakia's contribution towards deepening the process of all-European security is the proposal

for establishing a zone of confidence, cooperation and good neighbourly relations along the line dividing Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries.

In his address in the debate at the 3rd special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament, Minister Chnoupek recalled that the proposal, put forward by Communist Party General Secretary Milos Jakes in February, ensues from Czechoslovakia's exposed position in the heart of Europe, on the borderline between two systems and their military-political groupings.

He said Czechoslovakia would soon put forward concrete suggestions for the individual spheres covered by the Czechoslovak initiative, which would later be subjects of joint talks. As regards the military sphere, a zone could be created from which the most dangerous kinds of offensive weapons would be excluded.

Recalling that common sense triumphed with the conclusion of the Soviet-American INF Treaty and its recent ratification, he stressed that "Czechoslovakia committed itself to accept verification measures on its territory. Still before the ratification, Soviet shorter-range missiles, deployed at the end of 1983, were removed from its territory. Czechoslovakia will continue helping to speed up the disarmament process, he said.

Minister Chnoupek spoke of the need to set in motion a comprehensive system of international peace and security, which is being pressed for in the form of a proposal for cooperation in the military-political, economic, ecological and humanitarian spheres by the socialist countries.

He also said the Warsaw Treaty states were interested in the opening of talks on a substantial reduction of troops and conventional weapons in Europe, and in a faster advance towards a general and complete ban on tests of nuclear weapons, a treaty on a ban and liquidation of chemical weapons and towards achieving mutually acceptable solutions in the entire disarmament sphere.

Czechoslovakia is determined, together with its allies, to do everything for a speediest possible expansion of a worldwide disarmament process, while maintaining strategic stability. "Our proposals and the joint initiatives of the Warsaw Treaty states...are being put forward in a constructive spirit, in an effort to pay regard to the opinions of our partners at the negotiating table as much as possible," Bohuslav Chnoupek said.

He said he was convinced that the present session will make progress in the worldwide dialogue on disarmament, and added that this should be supported by an action document, worked out and adopted by the General Assembly session.

Talks With FRG's Genscher

LD0706083888 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak
0500 GMT 7 Jun 88

[Text] On the occasion of the 3d special United Nations General Assembly session on disarmament in New York, Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek had talks with FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. They exchanged views on topical issues of the international situation, with emphasis on promoting the processes initiated by the conference on security in Europe, and on prospects for talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms. They also devoted attention to the development of bilateral relations.

Bohuslav Chnoupek is to speak today during the general debate at the 3d special UN General Assembly session on disarmament. He will deal with our country's stand on problems arising from the current international situation.

Meets Greek, French Counterparts

LD0306195288 Prague CTK in English
1555 GMT 3 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 3 (CTK correspondent)—Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek met with his Greek counterpart Karolos Papoulias here today to discuss the implementation of some results of the recent visit by the Greek president to Czechoslovakia and exchange views on international topics.

The Greek foreign minister appreciated the Czechoslovak initiative aimed at the creation of a zone of confidence, cooperation and good neighbourly relations on the line dividing the Warsaw Treaty and NATO states.

On the same day the Czechoslovak foreign minister met with France's new Foreign Minister Roland Dumas to discuss bilateral relations.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Methodists Advocate Nuclear-Free World

AU0206104988 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 28-29 May 88 p 3

[Excerpt] Plauen (ADN)—In a peace message which was sent from Plauen to some 300 communities on Friday [27 May] the annual central conference of the Evangelical Methodist Church in the GDR advocates a nuclear-free world. The message also pays tribute to the GDR's peace initiatives. "We welcome and support the efforts of our government and of all political and social forces aimed at a nuclear-free world. With great pleasure and thankfulness to God, we welcome the conclusion of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of intermediate-range missiles," the message reads. The Evangelical Methodist Church in the GDR praises the commitment of all politicians who have good

intentions, and the impulses provided by Mikhail Gorbachev, and expects the early ratification of the INF Treaty to be followed by more far-reaching disarmament agreements. It strongly opposes measures aimed at thwarting the progress that has been achieved, either through rearmament or through modernization of other weapons systems. The conference decided to send a greetings telegram to the Moscow summit between Gorbachev and Reagan.

Delegation Activities at UN Special Session

Fischer, Florin Speak

LD0106093488 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1930 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] United Nations, New York, 31 May (ADN)—The UN General Assembly met today in New York for its third special session on disarmament. GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer opened the meeting in the great domed chamber of the UN building, and announced to the delegates of the 159 member states that the meeting is being followed attentively worldwide. "The great interest of the UN member states, which have sent high-ranking government representatives, and the numerous nonstate organizations represented here, underline this. The peoples attach to this forum the hope that disarmament negotiations in the spirit of security through disarmament, agreed upon at the first special session for disarmament, will receive a strong impetus. The most recent positive developments in international relations justify growing optimism."

The GDR foreign minister added that the treaty agreed upon last year between the USSR and the United States concerning the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is the first effective and far-reaching step in nuclear disarmament. Progress is expected from the meeting between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan taking place at the moment in Moscow. "The coincidence of both events—the summit meeting and this special session—has a deep symbolism. It shows that the dialogue on the decisive question for the survival of mankind—disarmament—is being intensified at all levels, bilateral and multilateral, in the interest of the peoples".

Afterwards, the UN delegates elected GDR deputy foreign minister Peter Florin, president of the 42d UN General Assembly, as president of the special disarmament session.

Peter Florin then spoke and thanked the delegates for the trust in him expressed by his election to the high office. The international situation, he said in his speech, has started moving forward. The elimination of 4-5 percent of all nuclear weapons, as provided for in the treaty on the abolition of intermediate-range missiles, should and can be the start of the road to a nuclear weapons-free world. The conflicts which continue to exist in the world and in which weapons are doing the talking do not

appear as insoluble as formerly. The accords on the settlement of the Afghanistan conflict are as much a proof of this as the continuing efforts to resolve the conflict in Central America.

But the nuclear arms race has still not been halted, Florin said. Nuclear weapons tests are continuing. The striving to pile up conventional weapons is continuing in many regions of the world. The arms race is placing an unbearable economic burden on the world. It is obvious that no country and no group of countries can solve the accumulating economic, social, and ecological problems and at the same time finance an increasingly expensive arms race.

Florin said that the latest summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan will give fresh impetus to further negotiations. "As realistic politicians, we know the significance of an understanding between the USSR and the United States for international developments, and that is why we welcome every constructive joint statement and action."

Touching upon the initiatives to promote the disarmament process, Peter Florin also pointed to the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to be held in Berlin at the end of June. He stressed that a halt to the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament has the highest priority. It is certainly no easy task to bring together all ideas and concepts of the states and groups of states. The UN special session will face up to this task, however. The dialogue on a comprehensive system of world peace and international security will be continued. He was confident that the session will become a forum for constructive and successful efforts of the world community to contain the arms race, to search for links in the positions of all groups of states, and to make bold and generally acceptable decisions.

Fischer Talks With UN Leader

*LD0106233588 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1948 GMT 1 Jun 88*

[Text] UN/New York, 1 Jun (ADN)—UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar and GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer met for a friendly talk in the UN Headquarters in New York today.

The foreign minister gave the UN representative a verbal message from Erich Honecker, which expresses the expectation that the third UN special session on disarmament will give fresh impetus to the international dialogue on disarmament and the strengthening of international security. It was stressed that there is a favorable political climate for this. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is regarded as a sign of a change for the better.

The GDR has promoted the creation of this agreement to the best of its ability and would conscientiously fulfill all the obligations arising from it. Now the halving of strategic offensive weapons with strict observance of the ABM Treaty should be made a reality.

The GDR hopes that the third UN special session will make its contribution to the adoption and implementation of further disarmament measures, in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security. What matters is to show the way toward a world free of weapons of mass destruction and violence.

At the sensitive dividing line between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the GDR feels itself profoundly committed to this cause. Working on its principle that only peace, and never again war, should emanate from German soil, it is working toward the creation of a nuclear-free corridor and a chemical weapons-free zone, as well as toward further measures for confidence-building and disarmament in central Europe.

The meeting for nuclear weapons-free zones to be held in June in Berlin will advance the dialogue and cooperation between the most diverse forces of peace, which are in favor of freedom from nuclear weapons in their regions as a path toward the liberation of the world from nuclear weapons. The process of disarmament, so vital for all mankind, the message continues, must not falter. The GDR is in favor of the special session of the UN General Assembly fostering an atmosphere of trust and cooperation, and intensifying the disarmament negotiations at all levels through resolutions directed toward action.

An agreement on a convention on the banning of chemical weapons is overdue. The GDR will immediately participate in such an important disarmament agreement. Progress regarding a ban on nuclear weapons tests, the prevention of an arms race in space, and the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms, especially in Europe, is of great significance.

Finally, the message expresses the conviction that, given the necessary political will and with regard to the legitimate security interests of all states, the UN special session will fulfill its goal of strengthening the role of the United Nations in securing peace and in making disarmament a dynamic and irreversible process.

The UN general secretary expressed thanks for this statement and described it as an important source of support for the cause of the third special session on disarmament. It encourages the world organization to reach results which further disarmament. Speaking of the exchange of the ratification documents relating to the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, Perez de Cuellar said that this act is an important sign of the trends toward relaxation of tension in the international arena.

He also regards the Berlin International Meeting on Nuclear-Free Zones as a specific contribution by the GDR, which should serve to prevent any pause in disarmament process. In the talk, the secretary general confirmed that the United Nations will take part in this international forum at a representative level.

In conclusion, the UN secretary general asked Foreign Minister Fischer to convey to Erich Honecker warm greetings and best wishes for his visible and fruitful commitment to peace and disarmament. He hopes that the UN special session will agree on a final document that will point the way for the years to come.

Fischer Addresses Assembly

LD0206203688 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1708 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] UN/New York, 2 Jun (ADN)—Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer explained the GDR's constructive attitude to questions of disarmament and international security at the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament today. At the start of his speech, which was received with great interest by the delegates of the 159 member states of the world organization, he paid tribute to the results of the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan.

This meeting lent a strong impetus to the worldwide striving for a far-reaching change from the arms race to a lasting and dynamic disarmament process. Everything agreed on in Moscow with the mandate of the allies of the Soviet Union or set in motion for future agreements on disarmament and detente and for the improvement of the international situation makes peace more secure. These results are eloquent testimony to what dialogue is capable of doing, despite all differences of opinion.

The foreign minister stressed that the realization is gaining ground that, in view of the growing mutual dependency of states, of scientific-technical progress, and of the existence of weapons whose use threatens all life on earth, security is now only lastingly achievable by political means, and only jointly by all states.

Not only military danger threatens the basis of human existence. Linked with worsening economic situations, above all in the developing countries, and with energy and environmental problems, the peaceful coexistence of peoples is threatened. While the arms race consumes the gigantic sum of \$2.5 billion daily, a quarter of mankind lives in poverty and 1 in 10 of the earth's population is undernourished.

The fact that the GDR time and again presses for dialogue and cooperation in Europe is due not least to its exposed position on the dividing line between the two most powerful military alliances. The use of only a fraction of existing nuclear and chemical weapons, even the use of the conventional arms concentrated there, would transform the continent into a desert.

The supreme maxim of the socialist German state is that only peace, and never again war, will emanate from German soil. In this connection the foreign minister explained the goals of the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to be held in Berlin in June. This event is based on the striving to advance the dialogue and cooperation of all those forces who want a nuclear weapons-free world. The fact that there is already confirmation of participation from over 100 states testifies to the need for an intensive exchange of experiences on viable paths to this goal.

Referring to the efforts for an international convention banning chemical weapons, Oskar Fischer said: The GDR possesses no chemical weapons and has not stationed these kinds of weapons from other states on its territory. It is not developing chemical weapons, nor does it possess plants for their production. It strongly supports the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe.

Finally, the minister said that the UN special session obliges all UN member states, large and small, to participate directly in the broad dialogue on military aspects of creating comprehensive security. The GDR is prepared to make its contribution to this.

Fischer Meets CSSR Official

LD0206195388 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1836 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] UN/New York, 2 Jun (ADN)—Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer and CSSR Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek met Thursday for a friendly exchange of views on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly in New York. The two ministers discussed bilateral issues and topics connected with the work of the General Assembly.

Fischer Meets PRC, Iranian Counterparts

LD0106223788 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1905 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] UN/New York, 1 June (ADN)—GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer had a cordial meeting in New York today with PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen. The two ministers paid tribute to the good level of relations between the GDR and China and reaffirmed their determination to develop friendly cooperation for the benefit of both peoples. This is facilitated both by the high-level contacts between the parties and governments of the two sides, and the specific development of economic, cultural and scientific-technological relations.

This is shown by such things as the fourth session of the GDR-PRC economic committee currently taking place. All this, it was stressed, brings the GDR and China closer together. The trade between the two states this year is 9 percent higher than last year. This shows that the agreements reached on the highest levels are being implemented in practice.

China's foreign minister said that his country is following with sympathy and interest the preparations for the International Meeting on Nuclear-Free Zones to be held 20-22 June in Berlin, and that it will participate in the work of this important forum with a representative delegation. This is based on the logic of the development of bilateral relations and on the shared interest in nuclear disarmament.

Qian Qichen stressed that in the struggle for peace the GDR is in the forefront of the European states. China respects this role. The two foreign ministers stressed that they are expecting constructive results and a forward-looking final document from the third UN special session on disarmament.

On the periphery of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Fischer also met with Iranian Foreign Minister Dr 'Ali Akbar Velayati. They both paid tribute to the level of bilateral relations between the two states.

Moscow Summit, INF Treaty Evaluated

Honecker Statement

LD0106165088 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1440 GMT 1 Jun 88

["Statement by Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SED Central Committee and GDR State Council Chairman, on the Results of the Moscow Summit"—ADN headline]

[Text] Berlin, 1 Jun (ADN)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and GDR State Council chairman, made the following statement on Wednesday on the results of the Moscow summit:

The results of the Moscow summit between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, meet with approval and support in the GDR. This is only natural since everything that was agreed on in Moscow with the mandate of the allies of the Soviet Union or that was put in process for future agreements on disarmament and detente, for an improvement in the international situation, makes peace more secure.

Particular importance must be attached to the exchange of ratification documents relating to the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate and Shorter-Range Missiles. This brings the historic treaty into force and inaugurates nuclear disarmament. From our point of view, encouraging conditions were created in Moscow for the continuation of this process, with a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons belonging to both states. There are prospects for the restriction of nuclear tests and for a global ban on chemical weapons. There is also a justified hope that missiles having a range less than 500 km will be included in the disarmament process. This is in the interests of peace and of both the German states.

It is important that the dialogue between the USSR and the United States on international and national issues be continued. It serves the cause of peace in the world.

In spite of the still-outstanding problems, negotiations on radical conventional disarmament in Europe are to be initiated. New possibilities are opening up for the political solution of regional conflicts.

These are results that benefit not only the USSR and the United States, but all nations. They are an eloquent witness to what political dialogue—given all the differences of opinion—can achieve.

The results of the Moscow summit have strengthened us in the GDR in our efforts to do all we can to remove confrontation and mistrust, to develop mutually advantageous cooperation, and to prevent new tragedies of war. To this end, the forthcoming International Meeting on Nuclear-Free Zones, to be held in Berlin, will for the first time bring together state, parliamentary, and social representatives on an unprecedented scale and will give fresh impetus to the disarmament process.

The prospects for developments in Europe and the world which were opened up in Moscow are further proof of the fact that a world with fewer weapons, and a world without nuclear weapons, is possible. Today, the various forces of reason are making this demand more and more forcefully.

Let us waste no time in continuing down the path opened by the Moscow summit. The nations expect it.

Spokesman Remarks

LD2805141888 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1305 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 28 May (ADN)—The GDR, as a country immediately affected by the INF Treaty, has learned of the treaty's ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the U.S. Senate with special satisfaction. Ambassador Wolfgang Meyer, GDR Foreign Ministry spokesman, told ADN in Berlin. Despite all obstacles, the constructive and patient effort of the socialist states to introduce the disarmament process has scored its first important success. By means of the ratification, an encouraging signal has been given to all political forces interested in disarmament and detente to continue their efforts for further important disarmament agreements. The signing of this treaty and the subsequent political and legal processes of its implementation, which are now concluded, has shown the world that even for complicated issues, solutions are possible and attainable if all parties involved allow a sense of realism, perspicacity, and understanding for the interests of the other side to prevail.

Regarding the GDR, the speaker went on, it had, by way of recognition of the great importance of this treaty—as a result of the realization of which entire categories of

arms were eliminated for the first time—done everything possible to support its implementation. As early as January, the GDR Government concluded the state procedure for confirmation of the trilateral agreement between the GDR, the USSR, and the CSSR on the requisite inspections connected with the INF Treaty.

In accordance with the stipulations of this agreement, the GDR is currently making practical preparations in order to guarantee problem-free inspections by the United States of former missile sites on GDR territory—one of which is, as is well known, being rebuilt as a holiday home for GDR trade unions. In conclusion the speaker stressed the readiness of the GDR, together with its allies, to contribute to more security in Europe and the world, along the path of constructive dialogue with all political forces. This was also attested by the GDR's initiative for convening the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones to be held in Berlin from 20-22 June, which has met with an extraordinarily strong worldwide response.

Fischer Addresses UN General Assembly

*AU0706194188 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 3 Jun 88 p 5*

[Speech by GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer, at the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament in New York on 2 June: "Worldwide Elimination of Nuclear Weapons Is the Fundamental Issue of This Century"]

[Text] Comrade President:

It fills me with great satisfaction to see the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament being chaired by you.

I wish Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar much success in his further work to strengthen the United Nations, and also for his personal well-being. My thanks go to Ambassador Mansur Ahmad for his work full of initiatives to prepare this session.

Esteemed delegates:

The third UN special session on disarmament is taking place at a time that is important for further international development. The Moscow meeting of General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan has given a strong impetus to the worldwide striving for a far-reaching change from the arms race to a lasting and dynamic disarmament process.

"Everything that was agreed on in Moscow with the mandate of the allies of the Soviet Union or that was put in process for future agreements on disarmament and detente, for an improvement in the international situation, makes peace more secure," Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, said immediately after the

end of the summit. "These are results," the highest representative noted on behalf of the citizens and politicians of the socialist German states, "that benefit not only the USSR and the United States, but all nations. They are an eloquent witness to what political dialogue—given all the differences of opinion—can achieve. The results of the Moscow summit have strengthened us in the GDR in our efforts to do all we can to remove confrontation and mistrust, to develop mutually advantageous cooperation, and to prevent new tragedies of war."

Security Can Be Achieved Only Through Political Means

Esteemed delegates, above all the nuclear disarmament process has to be continued without pause. The worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this millennium has become the basic idea of this century. The insight that—in view of the increasing mutual dependence of countries, scientific-technological progress, and the existence of arms which threaten all life on earth—lasting security can be achieved only through political means, and only for all states together, is gaining ground. Political settlements for longstanding regional conflicts are emerging. Thus the military factor is being increasingly pushed back in international politics. Millions of people, nongovernmental organizations, people from politics, science, culture, and religion, demand to free the world once and for all from the all-threatening scourge of the arms race. With the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles of the USSR and the United States, the vision of a nuclear- and violence-free world begins to take shape for the first time in mankind's history.

This treaty is emphatically supported all over the world. The GDR has made its own contribution to the conclusion of the treaty and is now doing everything for its implementation. Thus, even before it came into force, those missiles that had to be deployed as a response to the appearance of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in West European states were withdrawn from GDR territory. Their destruction started weeks ago. One of the facilities for these weapons in the GDR is already being used as a vacation home. This shows how disarmament is of direct, tangible benefit to the people.

It should be the concern of the special session to help develop in detail the concept of "security through disarmament." The final document of the first special session on disarmament pointed the way for this development. The third special session on disarmament will live up to what is expected of it if it gives rise to a comprehensive dialogue on the basic questions of disarmament and to a guiding program of action.

Disarmament negotiations on bilateral, regional, or multilateral levels can be conducted with success only if all participants demonstrate their willingness to reach substantial results. This is the only way to find generally

acceptable solutions for difficult problems. Vivid proof of this are the declaration on increasing the effectiveness of the principle of not using, and not threatening to use, violence in international relations, that was adopted by the 42d session of the UN General Assembly; and the results of last year's international conference on disarmament and development. The 25th anniversary of the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Underwater; and the 20th anniversary of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also provide evidence of this.

The People Do Not Want a Shift of the Threat

Comrade President, the international situation still remains contradictory and mankind's existence is still threatened by the accumulated destructive potentials. A nuclear war would be the end of any civilization. Wars pursued with other means of mass destruction or with conventional weapons would also have disastrous consequences. Science and technology are spawning new destructive weapons more quickly than disarmament agreements can be reached. And even now enormous financial means and many creative minds are necessary to destroy the accumulated armament potential without damage to mankind. In addition, sticking to the so-called doctrines of deterrence makes the search for practical and immediately enforceable disarmament agreements extremely difficult. Thus efforts to compensate for the first nuclear disarmament treaty by a more intensive arms race in other directions or under the excuse of "modernization" must cause concern. The people do not want a shift of the threat from one clearly visible area to fields that are less obvious—the people want the verifiable and irrevocable elimination of all threats to their existence.

With good reason it is pointed out ever more frequently that not only the danger of the—intentional or unintentional—use of military power is threatening the basis of mankind's existence. The directly resulting continuous deterioration of the economic situation, in particular in the developing countries, and energy and environmental problems, endanger the peaceful coexistence of the peoples. While the arms race devours the gigantic sum of \$2,500 million per day, a quarter of mankind lives in poverty and every tenth person is undernourished. Understanding is increasing of the fact that the solution to global problems requires the constructive cooperation of all states and the freeing of considerable resources through disarmament.

The struggle to overcome underdevelopment, to achieve a just settlement of acute international economic problems, and to democratize international economic relations is therefore linked ever more closely with the struggle for peace and disarmament. It is demanded with great emphasis that cooperation be achieved on an equal basis, for the economic security and stable development of all countries.

A comprehensive system of world peace and international security, established on the basis of the principles of equality and equal security, a balance of interests, and mutual advantage, would also benefit this goal. This requires changes in the thinking and acting of states, and bold ideas and actions, as Albert Einstein predicted would be necessary in the nuclear age.

The GDR Urges Dialogue and Cooperation in Europe

As an important contribution to this, the Warsaw Pact member states published the principles of their military doctrine at their Berlin session last year. It is of strictly defensive character and aimed only at repelling armed aggression. An appeal is issued to all nuclear powers to pledge themselves to forsake first-use of nuclear weapons and, ultimately, to totally renounce their use. The military forces of all states should be sufficient for the principle of not being able to attack. This would considerably improve the conditions for disarmament.

The GDR's repeated urging for dialogue and cooperation in Europe is the result of its exposed situation at the borderline between the two most powerful military alliances. There is no doubt that the use of only a fraction of the thousands of nuclear and chemical weapons—yes, even the use of the conventional armaments concentrated in this region—would lay waste to the continent. And, contrary to the time after World War I or World War II, the consequences for the world would be totally unpredictable. No matter whether a country would be directly involved in a nuclear conflict or not, whether it would be located in the center of such a conflict or on the fringe—every country would be affected today. And do not the political-military conflicts of the present teach us how difficult it is to limit and peacefully end armed conflicts once they have been started?

Therefore, in Sofia the Warsaw Pact states proposed to all CSCE states to start negotiations on the drastic reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals, within the CSCE program, by the end of the year, and to publish information on their armaments.

Esteemed delegates, from this rostrum I repeat: Only peace, and never again war, must emanate from German soil. This is the supreme principle of the socialist German state. It springs from the essence of socialism and takes into consideration the lessons of history.

Therefore, the GDR has repeatedly taken the initiative to promote disarmament and security on a global as well as on a regional scale. This month—in order to underline the concern of this special session, so to speak—an "International Meeting for Nuclear-Free Zones" will take place in the GDR's capital city. It is based on the effort to promote dialogue and cooperation of all those forces that want to establish a nuclear-free world.

Participants From More Than 100 States Registered for the Berlin Meeting

The registrations of participants from more than 100 states that have already arrived prove the need for an intensive exchange of experiences on viable ways toward a nuclear-free world. Increasing efforts of many other peoples and states to establish nuclear-free and peace zones in the region of the Indian Ocean, in Africa, the South Atlantic and in other regions encourage us to undertake regional initiatives in Europe. The treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga show that such projects can be realized and are effective.

Together with the CSSR, the GDR has proposed to the FRG the establishment of a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe. Such a solution would gain even more importance after the double zero-option for intermediate-range missiles.

In this connection, in his letter to FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl on 16 December 1987, Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, stressed: "Permit me to once again stress the GDR's emphatic interest in immediately expanding nuclear disarmament in Europe to other fields. The nuclear arms systems with a range under 500 km do concern the two German states in a special way. This was, among others, the guiding principle for the GDR in its proposal on a nuclear-free central Europe."

In principle, the GDR is willing to progress from zero-option to zero-option on the basis of equality and equal security.

I repeat—there must not be any pause in the process of arms limitation and disarmament. This is our view of things when we advocate a chemical-weapons-free zone in central Europe. The GDR does not have any chemical weapons, and there are no such weapons of other states deployed on its territory. It neither develops chemical weapons nor does it have facilities for their production.

Such a zone would be an important impetus for a global ban on these weapons. The governments of the GDR and the CSSR recently affirmed their proposal to immediately start result-oriented negotiations with the FRG on freeing the territories of the three states from chemical weapons or keeping them free of these weapons. Here the parts of the convention on the ban of chemical weapons, in particular those relating to verification, that have already been agreed on in Geneva could be included and thus being tested in practice. It is now necessary to immediately start negotiations on the proposed projects.

The ban on chemical weapons is already overdue. We share the widespread concern about the production of chemical binary weapons that has been started and about the concepts of establishing "security stockpiles." They

are directly in contradiction with the conclusion of a convention on the ban of all chemical weapons, which the GDR would join immediately.

This special session should be used to make the negotiations that have slowed down recently speed up again. It could, for instance, recommend to the disarmament conference to discuss specific measures at a foreign ministers' session in order to immediately complete work for the convention. In 1987 the GDR introduced export regulation for certain chemicals in order to prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons.

Space Must Not Become the Arena of the Arms Race

A multilateral exchange of data and test inspection would not only improve the atmosphere of the negotiations but would also lead to important experiences for putting the convention into practice. Last year the GDR made a contribution to this with an international experts' seminar in a chemical enterprise. At present domestic conditions are being established to submit data to the summer session of the disarmament conference on the chemicals that are affected by a convention and to prepare a test inspection in the GDR.

The prospects for a nuclear test ban have improved. We expect the Soviet-U.S. negotiations to quickly lead to a reduction of the number and capacity of the tests.

At the same time the Geneva disarmament conference should pave the way toward a comprehensive solution by working out first a comprehensive international control system for a nuclear test stop.

Space must not become the arena of the arms race in the 21st century—this is the demand of almost all states and peoples. In line with their mandate of 8 January 1985, the Soviet-U.S. negotiations have to contribute to this. Simultaneously, it is time to start negotiations within the framework of the Geneva disarmament conference. The ban on antisatellite weapons that the GDR and the Mongolian People's Republic proposed a year ago could be a first step in this direction.

We think that more openness in military affairs is necessary to reduce mistrust in the international relations and to replace it with an atmosphere of predictability. It serves the establishment of trust that, for instance, numerous business-like contacts between military representatives of the states of the Warsaw Pact and NATO as well as of the neutral and nonaligned states have developed in implementing the 1986 Stockholm Document. Now it is time to agree on further confidence-building and security measures within the CSCE that should also apply to naval and air forces.

Verification of Disarmament Is To Strengthen Trust

All disarmament must be verified. Not only the experts agree on that. We think that the decisive goal of verification is to strengthen trust in the fulfillment of the respective agreements and to provide an essential guarantee for international security. Therefore, the GDR is ready for all verification measures that serve disarmament.

The United Nations is qualified to become the guarantor of comprehensive international security in all stages of an effective disarmament process and of world peace. The GDR therefore welcomes the proposal of the six-state initiative to establish an international verification system within the framework of this organization. Drawing up a corresponding UN study might be a useful step toward this end.

The international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development has adopted valuable recommendations that are of direct importance for the establishment of comprehensive security. We support the formation of a "disarmament for development" fund and the holding of a UN Security Council session at the highest level.

Joint Solutions for Mankind's Survival

The GDR considers it necessary to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, and is in favor of raising the effectiveness of the international disarmament bodies, particularly the Geneva disarmament conference.

The work of the United Nations in educating, training, and informing the world public on all aspects of the arms race and disarmament promotes disarmament and strengthens the forces that work for it. Declaring the 1990's the decade of establishing a nuclear- and violence-free world would make an essential contribution to this goal.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me summarize: The GDR supports a substantial and specific final document that contains tasks that can be fulfilled immediately, and also includes long-term goals. Priority measures are:

First, the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war, the liquidation of all nuclear weapons, and the prevention of an arms race in space;

Second, the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, including a ban on chemical and other means of mass destruction and weapons with great destructive power;

Third, a halt of the arms race at sea and the elimination of foreign military bases;

Fourth, the renunciation of destabilizing armament technologies;

Fifth, confidence-building, openness, and predictability in military affairs and a continuous and comprehensive verification of all disarmament measures and remaining military potentials;

Sixth, the freeing of financial means through disarmament, and their use for the economic and social development of the people, in particular in the developing countries.

This special session obligates the UN member states—whether they are big or small—to directly participate in the broad dialogue on military aspects of establishing comprehensive security, and related questions. Let us make use of this chance and together look for solutions to ensure mankind's survival. The GDR is willing to make its contribution to this effort.

HUNGARY

NEPSZABADSAG on Soviet-U.S. Summit
LD2805074888 Budapest MTI in English
0031 GMT 28 May 88

[Excerpts] Budapest, May 28 (MTI)—The Saturday NEPSZABADSAG carries an editorial on the Gorbachev-Reagan summit to open on Sunday.

"The road to the summit has been long, and the part taken by Ronald Reagan was also long. Did any of us believe even four years ago that the President will start negotiations with the Soviet leader? Tomorrow he will set a new record: He is meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev for the fourth time in two and a half years. There has been no President since the Second World War who has had such frequent contact with the Soviet leadership."

"Naturally, the U.S. President has not given up his conservative principles, but he is ready to face reality. His merits are not diminished by the fact that since the April plenary session of 1985 reality itself has changed. This process has brought about such a turn both in the Soviet domestic and foreign policy that it transformed the traditional conceptions formed by the world."

"The fourth Reagan-Gorbachev summit bears the opportunity of a fifth, with Budapest as a possible venue. The Soviet general secretary declared that he is ready to sign an agreement on the 50 percent reduction of strategic arms, provided it is reached in the term of Reagan. The general secretary expects a new level of understanding and the long-term improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations from the Moscow summit. So does the world," says NEPSZABADSAG.

ROMANIA

'Military Balance' Through Disarmament Supported

AU2805155188 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1442 GMT 28 May 88

[A 'Military Balance' Through Disarmament and Not by Filling the 'Gaps' in Military Arsenals"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest AGERPRES 28/5/1988—In its Saturday's issue, the leading Bucharest newspaper ROMANIA LIBERA runs an article to take stance against the ever more marked tendencies that have emerged of a number of NATO countries towards eluding the true meaning of the INF Treaty. The concern on the part of strategists to fill in the "gaps" in military stockpiles, the newspaper writes, has never been as apparent as it is now when a number of nuclear weapons are to be eliminated from certain arsenals.

As is known, by applying the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles (the INF Treaty) the existing nuclear potential drops by five percent at the most. That is why, the significance of that accord resides in the creation of a precedent on the road to disarmament rather than in a palpable reduction of the destructive force of atom-based weapons.

Through a "turn of the notion", which is intended to be both subtle and disinterested, but which, in fact, is exactly the opposite, a number of Western strategists give priority to the latter aspect. Consequently, they sound the alarm and, more particularly, they make recommendations and proposals for the quantitative and qualitative growth of the military stockpiles of NATO countries which, according to their statements, are intended to annihilate the effects of the "nuclear decoupling" between the USA and the respective states.

In consideration of the fact that the treaty signed last December in Washington prohibits the manufacture of aircraft—or submarine-based weapons, a number of Western strategists take action, under the sign of...legality, to develop existing types or create new types of airborne nuclear missiles and of weapons based on submarine military vessels. [sentence as received]

In consideration of what the treaty does not stipulate proposals are made for a rise in the number of missiles with a range below 500 kms, in a simultaneous attempt at avoiding the third "zero option".

In other cases, rather transparent "hints" are made, such as that whereby the Federal Republic of Germany is required to continue to accept the location of short-range missiles in its territory. And other opinions, too, converge in the same direction.

Undoubtedly, the Romanian newspaper points out, all the individuals who think of disarmament-related questions in a realistic manner wonder about the meaning of all these attempts.

Like weapons, ROMANIA LIBERA further writes, are considered to intensify rather than lessen international stability.... However, the objective question arises: Could like answer, which is set on the outlook that by implementing the INF treaty the Western world would find itself in the open, be satisfactory?

All in all, the image of the balance of forces in Europe appears equilibrated. There is a balance, and that balance must be preserved, ROMANIA LIBERA writes and shows in conclusion: However, the solution that meets the interests of the peoples and of peace is not to look for equality upwards. On the contrary, a balance must be achieved through disarmament. In this respect, the application of the first accord on nuclear disarmament should not be followed by actions to "fill" the possible "gap" in nuclear arsenals, but by steps intended to prove that "in the eleventh hour" everyone understood that the only chance for the survival of the earth and of its inhabitants is disarmament. A chance that can be attained step by step.

Opening of UN Disarmament Session Marked

AU3005203388 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1930 GMT 30 May 88

["Romania and the Problems of Disarmament"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 30/05/1988—The proceedings of the third UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament, a political event which the international public opinion, that is ever more concerned over the continuation of the dangerous nuclear, chemical and conventional arms race and over the threat posed by the diversion of the gains of science and technology to destructive purposes, that are harmful to mankind, awaits with keen interest, opens in New York on Tuesday.

After 1978 and 1982, this is the third time the UN General Assembly devotes a special session to disarmament which, in the outlook of Romania and President Nicolae Ceausescu, is a fundamental problem of our days.

The major target of the current session is the elaboration of a programme of action to cover various aspects of disarmament in the nuclear and conventional areas, as well as measures to boost confidence.

As is known, the Executive Political Committee of the CC of the RCP agreed that, according to the mandate entrusted to them, the Romanian delegation should actively promote their country's stance and President Nicolae Ceausescu's outlook on and proposals for the

cessation of the arms race, of the nuclear arms race in the first place, the achievement of a passage to disarmament, the prevention of outer space militarization, an end to nuclear-weapon tests, the liquidation of chemical arms, the substantial reduction of conventional weapons, of troops and military spending, the removal of the war threat and the ensurance of the nations' and people's foremost right to existence, to freedom, to independence, to peace.

The Romanian delegation are empowered to reiterate their country's will to further work for the strengthening of cooperation with all peoples, with the advanced forces everywhere, in the fight for the firm assertion of the peace, disarmament and collaboration policy, for the elimination of the use and threat of force from international relations, for the constructive settlement of the major issues facing mankind, for the building of a better and more just world, free of weapons and war, in which each nation may concentrate its creative efforts on free, self-reliant development on the road of economic and social progress.

Gorbachev-Reagan Summit in Moscow Reported
AU0706144488 Bucharest LUMEA No 23 in Romanian
2 Jun 88 pp 7, 8

[Vasile Crisu article: "Soviet-American Summit Talks"]

[Text] A new Soviet-American summit meeting began at the Kremlin on the afternoon of 29 May. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan are sitting at the negotiating table for the fourth time. The current dialogue also marks the first visit of a head of the U.S. administration to the USSR for 14 years. The preceding talks took place in Geneva (1985), Reykjavik (1986), and Washington (1987).

The agenda of the Moscow meeting includes, as the subject of the exchange of views, numerous current international issues and, naturally, questions of bilateral relations. Within this framework, the talks on main aspects of disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, are followed with particular interest by public opinion and all peoples, by taking into consideration the particular responsibilities these two states with such considerable weight are called upon to assume in practice in this respect. Especially new impulses are expected in order to move to achieving, in the shortest possible time, an agreement between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of intermediate-range nuclear missiles and to speed up the conclusion, as soon as possible, of an agreement between the two great nuclear powers on cutting strategic nuclear weapons by half—tangible measures that, undoubtedly, will pave the way for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The stress placed before the Moscow summit meeting by prominent political figures in both Europe and other parts of the world and by front-ranking representatives of progressive forces and of mass and civic organizations on the major aspects

of the agenda of the two leaders stems from the feeling that, after the signing—in Washington last December—of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF), things "slowed down." Thus the INF agreement was ratified in extremis only 48 hours before the beginning of the Kremlin talks. It was hailed everywhere as a historic event and as a first step on the actual road to nuclear disarmament, a modest step when considering the percentage of weapons that are to be eliminated compared with that of weapons still preserved in nuclear arsenals (some 3 percent of the total), but which set the basis for future actions that hopefully will be infinitely more vigorous. At the same time, at the Washington meeting it was decided that the next step should be an accord on a 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear weapons by the USSR and the United States, and the hope was expressed that it would be concluded during the visit of the U.S. President to Moscow. This hope gradually diminished in subsequent months. The frequent meetings of the foreign ministers of the two countries each time marked progress in this respect, but finally it was announced that this accord cannot be concluded for the fourth Soviet-American summit meeting. The slow pace of negotiations on this accord naturally has many causes. The first one being the complexity of issues under discussion, especially those linked with verification. However, as observers specify, time is pressing. Despite certain favorable tendencies, the international situation continues to be serious. There are no signs that the arms race is lessening but, on the contrary, the sources of armed conflict still exist and many of the contradictions of the present-day world are intensifying. The threats for peace continue to be great and it is obvious that one cannot speak of peace, security, and safety for the future if nuclear weapons are not stopped and eliminated and if no determined action is being taken to cut conventional arms and to eliminate, in the final analysis, any types of weapons.

When this edition was finished, only the first rounds of talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan had been held. According to the statements made by the spokesmen of the two sides, these talks had taken place in a constructive working atmosphere and were assessed as a "good beginning." Worth mentioning is the fact that the talks focused on disarmament issues, although other aspects were also discussed. The two sides examined particularly the obstacles that must be eliminated on the road to preparing the treaty on a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons. Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of Information Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, declared after the second round of talks. He also pointed out that the Soviet side expressed the wish to prepare and to sign this treaty with the current Administration. I had the impression, he said, that the current Administration has received this desire positively.

As a matter of fact, at the dinner given Monday evening in honor of the U.S. President, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed the importance of the common conclusion of

historic importance that had been reached during the Soviet-American summit dialogue, despite all differences, namely that in a nuclear war there cannot be any victors, and therefore it should not be unleashed. Our main concern, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said, continues to be the formulation of the treaty on a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, while respecting the ABM Treaty. Stressing, in turn, that the first step had been taken in the direction of reducing the nuclear arsenals of the two states, President Ronald Reagan pointed to the intention of the United States to act, together with the USSR, to arrive at a new treaty in the period left of his presidential mandate, and expressed the hope that these efforts will be crowned by success.

The summit talks in Moscow are coupled by a number of contacts between officials accompanying the chief of the

U.S. Administration and Soviet officials. Thus, Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, met with U.S. Foreign Secretary George Shultz. Likewise, a meeting was held between Army General Dmitriy Yazov, minister of defense of the USSR, and Frank Carlucci, U.S. defense secretary. Groups of experts were also set up to additionally examine the issues on the agenda of the summit talks.

The date when our magazine is published will coincide with the day of the end of the fourth Soviet-American summit meeting. What is expected up to then is the exchange of the ratification instruments of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the signing of some understandings of a bilateral nature. It is expected that the dialogue will conclude by issuing a document on its results.

Civilian Economic Gain From TEL Dismantlement

18010342a Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 22 1988 p 4

[Unattributed 150-word article entitled: "Cranes Instead of Missiles"]

[Text] AiF has already discussed how a civilian economic impact may be expected from the realization of the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of short- and intermediate-range missiles. Highly qualified specialists will be freed for work in the civilian economy. Industrial power will be reconfigured for the output of new, currently urgently needed products, such as baby carriages and quality washing machines....

Recently the American magazine TIME discussed new possibilities for the use of elements of combat equipment for peaceful necessities. The discussion concerns a Soviet-West German contract on reequipping transporters for Soviet intermediate-range missiles into gigantic mobile cranes. TIME emphasized in particular that the Soviet proposal on cooperation with the West German firm ?"Libkher Verk" [?Liebherr Werk] was put forward just six weeks after the Washington summit.

Installed on a Soviet transporter, the West German mechanism with a 75-meter telescoping arm is able to lift a 154-ton load. They will be used for the construction of bridges and large industrial objects.

The ?"Libkher Verk" [?Liebherr Werk] company has already supplied to the Soviet Union equipment for maintenance in the low temperature conditions of the construction of the Transsiberian gas pipeline, as well as equipment which was used in the elimination of the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster.

As TIME notes in the next five years, given the cooperation of the Odessa enterprise "Yanvarets" the West German firm plans to achieve an output of up to 700 mobile cranes per year.

UD/335

Review of Western Hydroacoustic Mine Hunting Systems

18010310b Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Feb 88 p 3

[Article by Capt 3d Rank A. Kolpakov under rubric "Military Technical Review": "Hydroacoustic Mine Detection Stations"]

[Text] As formerly, they are considered to be an effective and promising means of underwater mine detection. Hydroacoustic stations [sonar] are placed on minesweeper-mine hunters and are a part of the hydroacoustic systems of submarines and surface ships.

The advantage of the stations that have appeared in recent years in the U.S. Navy and in NATO country navies in comparison with much earlier modifications, foreign specialists note, is the short pulse duration and the high frequency of tracking, which provides a good angular resolution capability. However, observers mention that these are also not without shortcomings, because a search is frequently accompanied by false alarms. This is explained by the fact that emitted signals are reflected from uneven and dissimilar areas of the ocean floor, and from sunken objects, and even from large fish. The use of protective coverings on mines and other measures for reducing acoustic detectability significantly decreases the effectiveness of the combat employment of hydroacoustic stations.

Stations that are in the armaments inventory of the U.S. Navy and NATO navies can be divided into two basic groups. To the first belong stations mounted under a ship's keel. Their receiver-emitter devices are installed in special domes which are extended with the help of lifting and lowering apparatuses under the bottom of the ship. Towed hydroacoustic mine detection stations belong to the second group. Their distinguishing characteristic is that they can be placed at a required depth, and to the extent necessary, they can be brought closer to the bottom or moved away from it. Foreign specialists say that the disadvantage of towed stations is that they do not detect a mine in front of the minesweeper, but behind its stern.

According to the journal INTERNATIONAL DEFENSE REVIEW, minesweeper-mine hunters of the French Navy are equipped with the TSM 2022 station. It is capable of detecting bottom mines to a depth of up to 120 meters at a ship speed of up to 10 knots. Moreover, mine location is pinpointed with an error of not more than 1 meter.

The journal SEKAI-NO KANSEN describes the English hydroacoustic mine detection station 193M, which ensures detection of bottom objects with a diameter over 0.46 meters and a length of 1.53 meters at a distance of 550 meters from the minesweeper. The 193M is to be replaced by the 2093 station with a towed antenna for the new English minesweeper-mine hunter of the "Sundown" type. The range of this station is two times greater than that of the 193M, and the maximum search speed is 12 knots.

As foreign specialists note, the American station AN/SQQ-32, intended for the armaments of the minesweeper-hunter of the "Avenger" type, has highly modern means of forming hydroacoustic beams and automated systems for processing hydroacoustic information. This makes it possible to isolate signals from mines against a background of reverberations and other interferences and to automatically reject signals from objects that are not mines.

The command of the U.S. Navy and of the NATO country navies, as the journal INTERNATIONAL DEFENSE REVIEW reports, is paying a lot of attention to the improvement of existing hydroacoustic mine detection stations and to the creation of new ones. Work is being conducted in the direction of increasing the trustworthiness and reliability of classification and detection of mine-like objects, including at high speeds (10-15, and also possibly 20 knots), and even the probability of detection of mines of various types. Moreover, an increase in search speed is considered to be an effective means of decreasing the total number of necessary antimine forces.

A lot of attention is also being given abroad to the development of modern means of automatic identification of targets, increasing the clarity of scope reflections at the instant of contact, reducing magnetic field levels and increasing station blast resistance and repairability. Tactical and operational requirements are being worked up for prospective lateral scanning hydroacoustic stations.

13052

Examination of U.S. Binary Weapons, Delivery Vehicles

18010310a Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
12 Feb 88 p 3

[Article by M. Platunov, engineer, under the rubric "Military Technical Review": "Creators of 'Binary Death'"]

[Text] The production line in American enterprises that produces "binary death" is gathering steam. Apropos of this, THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper put it this way: "The start of production of binary munitions in a military plant in Pine Bluff in the south of Arkansas is viewed by Pentagon officials as an event that has a symbolic meaning.... It has put an end to the 14-year fight of the Army to overcome opposition in the country and to win the support of Congress with respect to appropriations for the production of more than 1 million binary artillery projectiles, each of which is capable of killing hundreds of people in 2 to 5 minutes...."

The 155-mm artillery projectile also belongs to the new generation of chemical munitions that are called binary. The word "binary" means that a munition consists of two parts or components that are stored separately. When separated they have little toxicity, but when mixed they react and form a toxic agent.

According to information from the journal JANE'S DEFENSE REVIEW, the binary 155-mm projectile, designated M687, has the components difluorene, which is placed in the nose of the projectile, and isopropanol. The capsule with this substance is stored separately and is placed in the bottom part of the projectile in the process of its immediate preparation for firing. During

firing, the "partition" that separates the components collapses. At the time of projectile flight to the target, the interaction that forms the nerve paralysis toxic agent—sarin—is completed. The spinning of the projectile on a trajectory at a speed of up to 25 revolutions per second promotes the complete flow of the components. The projectile blast is produced in the area of enemy manpower dispositions.

U.S. ground forces and marines have in their weapons inventory several thousand 155-mm self-propelled and towed guns (also including the M109A2 howitzer) capable of firing binary projectiles for a distance of up to 20 km. It is also planned subsequently to start production of a projectile with the very same makeup for the 203.2-mm howitzer. Besides artillery munitions, the U.S. is also creating other types of binary munitions. Thus, the binary warhead XM-135 is planned for the 227-mm salvo fire MLRS rocket system. This system, as is known, has been in the weapons inventory of the U.S. Army starting in the 1980s. The troops have already received about 300 combat vehicles that have a range of fire of 32 km with a rocket projectile with a warhead weighing 159 kg, and with a lighter one (107 kg), to a range up to 40 km. With one salvo, this 12-shot launcher load, columnists observe, can in 50 seconds destroy a target located in an area with dimensions of 400 by 1,000 meters.

According to foreign press data, the XM-135 warhead should be ready for series production in the 1991 fiscal year. But the Pentagon plans to organize the output of the "Bigeye" binary chemical aviation bomb before this. It is filled with components that form the toxic agent of the VX type which, like sarin, has a nerve paralysis effect, but which is even more fatal.

The "Bigeye" aviation bomb is one of three types of new generation chemical weapons which, according to a recent statement by President R. Reagan, has "a vitally important significance for U.S. national security." This assertion not only contradicts recent events, but it also shows the true attitude of the American administration toward chemical disarmament.

The production of "binary death" promises someone large profits. Ninety million dollars is appropriated for this purpose, and the newest chemical weapon should begin to appear no later than 1990.

The U.S. Air Force intends to arm tactical fighters and ground attack aircraft with the "Bigeye" bomb, including squadrons of "F-4," "F-16," and "F-111" aircraft deployed in western Europe. The Navy plans to place the "Bigeye" bomb on aircraft carriers and to employ it with the help of carrier aircraft. Binary warheads can also be carried by cruise missiles of the "Harpoon" type and by some other missiles of the "air-to-ground" class.

According to a statement of American specialists, "the important advantage that binary munitions have over conventional chemical weapons is their safety in the production process and during transportation and operational employment."

Covering themselves with references to a chemical threat, which supposedly comes from the Soviet Union, U.S. ruling circles are speeding up the implementation of the "chemical rearmament" program. A manifestation of this, in particular, is the buildup in annual production capacity of up to 700,000 binary artillery projectiles and aviation bombs, and the intention of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff to increase the number of chemical munitions at its disposal, including binary munitions, from 3 to 5 million units.

In analyzing the state of affairs with respect to binary munitions, many foreign observers note that the binary program is the reason why the U.S. recently began to hold up ongoing negotiations in Geneva on a ban on chemical weapons, and that these actions are nothing more than an attempt to torpedo the process of chemical disarmament.

13052

PRAVDA Report From Missile Destruction Site
PM0506144388 Moscow PRAVDA Second Edition in Russian 2 Jun 88 p 6

[PRAVDA correspondent G. Dildyayev report: "Saryozek: Just a Rehearsal This Time. Reportage From Site for the Elimination of Shorter-Range Missiles"]

[Text] Kazakh SSR—The spring here was extremely cold and long drawnout. The weather only cleared up and the sky only saw the last of the rainclouds as spring was drawing to an end. Emerald tongues of lush verdure licked the reddish slopes of the countless rolling hills surrounding the missilemen's military settlement. Silence reigns here.

However, a boom rang out: After being piled up and loaded with TNT charges, missiles were blown up. They were blown up in complete accordance with the memorandum governing procedures for the elimination of an entire class of USSR and U.S. missile systems. The test had been carried out to see what would happen. It was not a poisonous mushroom cloud that billowed up into the sky—a colorful firework display appeared. This was caused by the combustion of traces of missile fuel.

The explosion was quiet, and the echo rapidly died away in the hills.

We stood on the unit parade ground, where there was the usual hubbub of Army life. Everything seemed normal, but today this unit is one of the most unusual in the Armed Forces.

"The last launcher was recently sent away and completely disarmed. Only personal firearms are left. Yes, we are taking away the explosives for future work...."

Commander A. Borodin is a young man, but he has an enviable service record. In 1970, he graduated from college. He served in the Volga region and Central Asia. This is his 3d year in Saryozek. He knows the SS-12's and SS-23's inside out.

"We must learn how to destroy the missiles; this is not the simple business that it may appear at first glance. We are also preparing to receive inspectors. We have plenty to worry about, sometimes the most unexpected things."

A. Borodin's collar tabs show crossed gunbarrels—the emblem of the artillerymen and missilemen.

"Shouldn't you change the emblem for another symbol—the symbol of disarmament?"

The lieutenant colonel reacted gravely to the joke.

"Like any sensible man, I cannot help but be delighted by the entry into force of the Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and U.S. Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. These missiles are closer than any others to the threshold of war. That's the first thing. The second is that we missilemen have received an unusual order. And it will be carried out."

How are high proficiency-rated specialists, who have spent long years studying and mastering the use of these missiles in combat, now organizing their destruction?

"Everyone in my family is a missileman: Both my father and my brother," Major A. Kalyazhenkov, deputy equipment commander, joined in the discussion. "Don't get me wrong. I am wholeheartedly in favor of disarmament. But many problems are cropping up for me and my colleagues on the personal plane. We'll have to retrain or leave the Army altogether...."

These were my thoughts while observing the efficient actions of this unit's officers and personnel. Perhaps, a new military specialism will arise before our very eyes? I don't know what it will be called. Disarmament specialist, perhaps?

Draftees have fewer questions. Although in their 2d year of service, they are having to do the reverse of what they learned in their 1st year.

We drove out to the demolition field, an ordinary hollow with scarlet steppe tulips withering around the edges. Local wits call this field "Borodino," reflecting the surname of the commander. There is an observation post on a nearby hill. From here, U.S. inspectors will observe the explosions which will roar out here for quite some time.

Bundles of several missiles are stacked right on the ground and the explosive laid according to a special diagram. Even when stacked up and without warheads, these carriers still retain their sleek lines and their formidable splendor. But they won't reach their target or vanish in the fiery inferno of a nuclear holocaust. These weapons of destruction will be destroyed.

I must mention something else. The cynicism of some "radio voices" is well known. They did not keep silent about the arrival of missile carrier trains in Saryozek and their upcoming destruction. But they presented this news with extremely unscrupulous commentaries and cuts. So among some of the population, there was talk of "radioactive contamination," "ecological damage," and so on. The news conference held by the Central Asian Military District Command put an end to this. An authoritative statement was given there that radioactive contamination is precluded since the nuclear charges will be removed in good time and sent for salvage. The explosions will be monitored by the ecological service.

Certainly, the explosions during the elimination of missiles are low key. But they can be heard echoing throughout the world.

Sarny Missile Base Open for Foreign Journalists
LD0306142288 Moscow TASS in English
1120 GMT 3 Jun 88

[Text] Sarny (Western Ukraine) June 3 TASS—By TASS special correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev:

The gates of the Sarny military base lying at a distance of 90 km from the city of Rovno have opened to correspondents of the mass media of the USA, Britain, the FRG, France, Belgium, Japan as well as Czechoslovakia and the GDR. The Soviet officers briefed them on how the process of elimination of the launchers and transport vehicles of the RSD-10 missiles, known in the West as SS-20, will be carried out. This operation will be performed under the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, which was signed in Washington in December 1987 and ratified by both sides a few days ago.

In the course of the Soviet-American summit meeting, ratification instruments on entry into force of the INF Treaty were exchanged and the protocol was signed on the exchange of these ratification instruments in an official ceremony in the Kremlin on June 1 between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

As is placed on record in the treaty, each party shall eliminate all its missiles and launchers of such missiles and all support equipment so that not later than 36 months after entry into force of this treaty and thereafter no such missiles, launchers or support equipment shall be possessed by either party.

SS-20 Dismantling Shown

LD0406231088 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 4 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Defense and USSR State Television and Radio Committee on 3 May organized a trip for a large group of Soviet and foreign journalists to Sarny, Rovno Oblast, to one of the bases where intermediate-range missiles are to be eliminated. The trip was organized in accordance with the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

[Correspondent Tikhomirov, over video of large numbers of journalists wielding cameras and microphones in pouring rain] Journalists from the United States do indeed think in a unique way. The very first question they asked when they entered the territory of the base, going into the accommodation zone where U.S. experts will be housed in a month's time, was: Why is there a perimeter wall here? Such suspicion is rather petty, one would say, against the background of the great confidence measures which his government has agreed to. But we do acknowledge, nevertheless, that the suspicion is mutual. You will agree that the perimeter fence is indeed pretty huge compared to the cottages for the Americans.

Altogether, it is unlikely that such a sizable international detachment of journalists has ever been quite so curious when looking around fairly ordinary housing accommodation: the beds, the conference room, and international telephones. I myself wanted to discover in the environs some startling detail, a symbol of the totally out-of-the-ordinary task which, for the first time in history, will be fully tackled here from 1 August in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. protocol.

To run on ahead a bit, I shall say that my journalist colleagues were somewhat disappointed at the prosaic nature of the technology we were shown and briefed on in Sarny. A base for eliminating the launch and transport means of the SS-20 missile complex is being commissioned here: machines like these, that is. [video shows missile transporters parked on tarmac] The missiles themselves will not be eliminated here, but at three other bases—Kapustin Yar, by explosion; and Kansk and Chita, by launching. [video shows Tikhomirov interviewing I.D. Sergeyev, elimination expert, next to one of missile transporters]

[Tikhomirov] Well, I don't expect you found it easy to develop destruction techniques, because when these missiles were created, there was absolutely no question of them being cut up or of how they could be most easily disassembled and destroyed.

[Sergeyev] It is extremely difficult, extremely difficult. A great deal of time was needed and a great deal of expense incurred to find the optimum ways with the minimum effect on the ecology, too.

[Tikhomirov] Furthermore, they have to be extremely clear and evident, since there will be a U.S. inspector here.

[Sergeyev] The U.S. inspector will satisfy himself that the missiles are irrevocably destroyed.

[Tikhomirov] And in Sarny, we watched an SS-20 launching facility ceasing to be a menacing weapon. It is not as effective, of course, as a missile exploding but no less graphic. The launching platform, easily maneuverable and therefore less vulnerable to the enemy, was stripped, as if naked, down to its bearing members, cables snaked about, units and blocks went [words indistinct].

Here the plasmatron, designed especially for cutting in the Paton Institute, is in operation: The Americans consider it sufficient to cut 78 cm of the frame, for the launching facility to cease being combat operational. That is all; it is left like a gun without a barrel. [video shows cutting operation under way; workshops with metal structures being dismantled]

Yet, how strange life turns out to be. Thousands of missile troop [words indistinct] in underground command points, were on duty, improving their combat readiness, further improving weapons. It has fallen to the lot of a section of them to spend 3 years disarming, destroying the SS-20's, missile facilities which the Americans themselves consider to be perfect, fifth-generation facilities.

[Sergeyev] I think this weapon played its role. In our estimation, as missile troops, the treaty is of equal worth: We are destroying new weapons, the Americans are also destroying their new weapons, which when deployed in Europe are for us strategic weapons. We as military men consider the treaty to be a just one.

[Tikhomirov] Isn't the material a bit too strong for the screen? lamented my foreign colleagues as they returned. But I, for instance, know that I shall derive sincere satisfaction when they start chopping up the Pershings in Europe because their flight time to us from there is about 4 minutes.

Report on INF Missile Destruction Sites

PM0806073788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian First Edition 4 Jun 88 p 5

[Report by special correspondents Colonel A. Belousov, Colonel V. Polezhayev under the rubric "Report From Control Center for the Elimination of Intermediate-Range Missiles": "RSD-10 and Others..."; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Soviet people who have been closely following the summit meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan witnessed the ceremony of exchanging ratification documents to bring the Treaty on the Elimination of

Intermediate-and Shorter-Range Missiles into force and the signing of the relevant protocol. The treaty became reality from this point in time.

In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding, which recorded the figures of 1 November 1987, our side is to eliminate 826 intermediate-range missiles and 608 of their launch installations, and 926 shorter-range missiles and 237 of their launch installations. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reported how servicemen are preparing to destroy the shorter-range missiles in an article entitled "Northwest of Saryozek," published on 10 April this year. Today we bring readers a report by our special correspondents on preparations to destroy intermediate-range missiles.

We had never attended a training session like it before. Normally, missile troops are taught how to make the maximum use of the combat potential inherent in a missile, but at this particular training session they had been set a different task—to learn how to destroy a missile competently and following the established procedure to the letter.

We will come back to the question of how unusual the situation is and how the missile troops themselves feel about it. But for the moment, we will acquaint ourselves with the atmosphere at the center controlling the elimination process and watch the specialists at work.

Virtually the entire wall of the spacious premises is taken up by the working map of the head of the center. On it are marked the regions of deployment and missile operating bases of our RSD-10's, R-12's, and R-14's, which are known in the United States as SS-20's, SS-4's, and SS-5's. Familiar names are marked in red: Lida, Mozyr, Ukmerge, Barnaul, Kansk.... We have often visited these places and referred to them in our material simply as "centers" or missile garrison "X." But times are changing. The Memorandum of Understanding gives the precise geographical coordinates of all missile operating bases and indicates the types and number of missiles, launchers, and support structures and equipment at these bases.

Officers A. Shilo, V. Avguchenko, Yu. Martynenko, and L. Rodionov were at their work stations. They have computers and other sophisticated equipment at their disposal, but you can still sense the intensity with which they work. We would like to say that it is as if time has been compressed as far as they are concerned. But this is not quite accurate, it transpires, because here the hours and minutes are indeed shorter: Training is carried out on a time scale where 1 hour represents 4 days. For example, a RSD-10 division would actually be on the move for 24 hours, but on the center's magnetic wall chart, the column of missile delivery vehicles is moved to a set point every 15 minutes.

The sites where the missiles are to be eliminated are ready. A population center has been chosen for the R-12: Lesnaya. This base has been set the task of destroying the missiles, the missile installations, launch platforms, and means of transport. Jumping on ahead, we must point out that the term "elimination" regarding means of transport for all types of missiles should not be taken literally. Certain units and mechanisms are removed from the chassis of the vehicle, but the vehicle itself remains and will naturally be put to use in the national economy.

With the help of visual display and other equipment, you can see how the process of eliminating the missiles will proceed. The R-12, for example, which operates on liquid fuel that is easily removed, is taken to a specially built unit once it has been shorn of its nuclear device. Specialists remove elements of the targeting system, insert an air plasma cutting instrument, and cut through the engine jets at points that do not constitute joints. They then remove the fuel tanks and the instrument chamber. And that, basically, is that.

The procedure is different for the RSD-10. This missile uses solid fuel, which is not easy to remove. You do not go near a tinder box with a naked flame. Two other methods of elimination have been chosen—launch and detonation. The launches will be carried out from Chita and Kansk areas on the mandatory condition that none of the missiles will be used as a moving target for a ballistic missile interceptor. The detonation of RSD-10's which have had their nuclear charge devices removed is to be carried out at the Kapustin Yar test site, where experiments have already been conducted in the presence of doctors and environmental protection specialists.

A great deal of attention at the training session was given to organizing the work of the staffs, commanders, and political workers responsible for safeguarding the activity of U.S. inspection groups. These problems are new. After all, no missile troop member has ever had to receive foreign inspectors before. Now they are faced with the prospect of working with them—sometimes under extremely tense conditions. For example, notification of the inspectors' arrival may only be given a few hours before the start of the inspection. They have to organize their reception and provide them with food, accommodation, work premises, transport, communication....

Incidentally, representatives of the mass media from a number of Western countries, the CSSR, and the GDR arrived yesterday in the city of Sarny in Rovno Oblast, where launchers and transport facilities for RSD-10's are to be eliminated.

So what do the elimination sites now represent? Take Lesnaya, for example. Situated in a picturesque area, from a helicopter and from the ground, it looks more like

a sanatorium than a base for destroying missiles. There are two-story cottages with comfortable rooms for the inspectors, a dining hall, and a leisure center.

The best officers from combat units and subunits—the best trained and the most enterprising—have been chosen for work in the center and at local level. Most of them are military experts who have been through the school of service in the troops—the school of combat duty. They have formed a vital bond with their category of troops, and every one of them is a missile man to the core.

The army biography of Colonel A. Gutnikov, chief of the center, is noteworthy in this respect. He graduated from artillery school in 1959. He joined the Rocket Forces during their formative period, when virtually everything had to be started from scratch. In a forested, mosquito-infested backwater, among marshy swamps, he erected tents with comrades from his regiment. The living quarters were a tent, the Lenin room was a tent, the training class was a tent. They had to learn, equip their positions, and train their subordinates all at the same time.

It was there, in that god-forsaken place, that the young lieutenant first saw a strategic missile raised onto the launch pad, ready to be fired into the air. The multistage body tapering to a cone and shining with a dull light seemed to him to be a living being retaining the warmth of many talented, skillful, careful hands.

Lieutenant Aleksandr Gutnikov and his comrades did everything possible to understand it perfectly.

In those years, they sometimes lived and worked in conditions where only their duty, their constant perception of extreme tension in the conflict between good and evil in the world, their sense of themselves being on the knife edge of this conflict, and their great sense of responsibility for its outcome were the sole source of their strength, energy, determination, and commitment to their troubled, selfless, but romantic profession.

The conflict between good and evil in the world.... Today it is still appropriate to recall how, having won the war forced upon them, Soviet people dreamed of peace and calm and how the smell of gunpowder soon filled the world again. Lieutenant Gutnikov, like all of us, knew why Hitler's V-1's and V-2's were moved to the other side of the ocean and why strenuous efforts were then made to modernize them: There were already a considerable number of nuclear warheads which were compatible with them. Plans to finish the Soviet Union in one stroke were hatching in hot heads that had been turned by a conceited belief in their own invulnerability and impunity. This is the situation in which our party and people took the decision to rapidly erect a reliable defensive barrier and forge a missile shield. In this situation, A. Gutnikov and hundreds of others—young officers and more experienced officers who had already

served for some time—became pioneers in an unprecedented task entrusted to them by the motherland at this disturbing time. We are not recalling that bleak and distant time for the sake of satisfying someone's curiosity or with the aim of getting at someone after the event. No, our reason is quite different: It is simply that without comprehending what happened then, it is hard to really understand what is happening now.

The biographies of the center chief's closest associates—officers V. Alekseyev and V. Bitskiy—are little different from that of Gutnikov himself. They were also involved in building launch installations among the plains and the forests. And, like Gutnikov, their service has consisted of a succession of garrisons, different generations of missile systems, and international military-political crises, of which no one has perhaps been so acutely aware as the Strategic Rocket Forces.

So what are their thoughts now, what are their feelings? Colonel Gutnikov said this: "How does a man feel who has to demolish his house for one reason or another—a house he built with his own hands and in which he has lived for many years? He is sorry, of course, that he has to smash his own creation. But he probably thinks more about the future and about how, for example, a garden is going to be laid in its place." Officers S. Kazakov, S. Khrulev, and V. Filyustin expressed their thoughts and feelings differently but the essence was the same: People are interpreting the situation in a state-minded spirit.

Highly qualified specialists, Communists, and people who have dedicated the best years of their life to the defense of the motherland, they are fully aware that nuclear missile weapons consume enormous amounts of mankind's strengths and resources. And now the hour has come when the terrible "megamachine" of confrontation created in an earlier age has begun to slow its menacing motion and there is a hope that it will ultimately grind to a halt. A profound awareness of this ultimately determines the attitude, deeds, and actions of the people now concerned with the problem of eliminating these weapons.

Pondering everything we had seen, at first we did not know what had amazed us most: The scale of the work done so far or the scale of the work that still has to be done in the next 3 years, during which time the missiles will all be destroyed. It was only later, when our impressions had had time to settle, that it became clear to us that the most important event had taken place earlier—

in Washington last December. The most important event was and still is the fact of the signing of the treaty, whose significance and consequences go far beyond the actual subject of the accords.

And the last point, which, we must admit, worries us. Active preparations are under way to destroy the missiles; everyone is talking about it and, naturally, everyone is wondering how the person taking over combat duty in the future is going to feel. Will the combat readiness of the Rocket Forces not suffer in this situation?

We took our questions to Colonel General Stanislav Grigoryevich Konemasov, chief of the Main Staff of the Strategic Rocket Forces.

He said:

"I have recently had occasion to visit many of the missile units whose arms are affected by the treaty. At each of these units, I had meetings with personnel and talked about everything in the Rocket Forces connected with the elimination of intermediate-range missiles. People are alarmed by what is happening, which is only natural. For example, at first officers and warrant officers were worried about how the elimination of the missiles would affect their future and what awaited those who had only just begun their service or were close to the end of their service. I will not try to conceal the fact that at first there were various conjectures and rumors in this connection.

"Now, however, thanks to explanatory work, the situation has normalized. The personnel directorate now has representatives from the center who are giving their thorough attention to resolving any personnel problems that may arise. No one will be ignored and everyone's interests will be given maximum consideration.

"Well, ultimately the attitude of the Rocket Forces is determined by the main point—the fact that there is no alternative to the party and government initiatives in the disarmament sphere and that the question of mankind's survival is more serious now than ever before. They are doing everything possible to carry out the tasks connected with implementing the treaty. The technology has been developed and there is every reason to believe that the planned schedules will be strictly and accurately observed.

"At the same time, we are not deluding ourselves that today's peace is unshakeable and will last forever. We proceed from realistic assessments of how these events will develop. The reality is such that there are no grounds for complacency. This means that we do not, cannot have the right to slacken our vigilance and combat readiness. The Strategic Rocket Forces have always taken this attitude to service and will continue to do so."

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

JUNE 29, 1988